Kannada Research Lectures Series No. 2

THREE LECTURES

BY

K. V. SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR, B. A.
Retired Superintendent for Epigraphy,
COIMBATORE

Kannada Research Office
DHARWAR

1941

PRICE RUPEE ONE

Published by
R. S. Panchamukhi, M. A.
Director of Kannada Research, Bombay Province,
at his office in Saraswat Colony, at Dharwar.

All Rights Reserved.

H1

13864

Printed by
V. Y. Jathar
at the Karnatak Printing Works,
DHARWAR

CONTENTS

		page
1.	Method of Historic Research.	1– 38
2 & 3.	Some Dark Spots in the History of the Rashtrakutas	38–115

Method of Historic Research

MR. PANCHAMUKHI AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD,

Let me first of all thank you for the honour you have done me in asking me to deliver a course of lectures on some topics connected with Research. Being one interested like you in the study of the past greatness of this country, it affords me great pleasure to respond to your request. But if you pitch your expectations high, I may tell you that you must be prepared for disappointment. I had often thought that the cause of research could be better advanced by a body of scholars taking to the work than by the efforts of single individuals however qualified the latter may be. Even individual scholars that had been working in the field, I am inclined to believe, must have necessarily sought the aid of others in arriving at a satisfactory solution of many a difficult problem that naturally crop up in the course of the enquiry. Two or more heads are sure to bring out other possibilities of a case than what one alone could do. It is the consideration and just disposal of such possibilities that really contribute to the ascertainment of truth. The task of search after truth is no doubt noble, but the difficulties that stand in the way are many. Your attempt to work in company is a sound one, and I trust that very soon many will follow the example you are setting. I could conceive that there are several impediments in organising a work of this nature. First and foremost is a proper equipment without which no tangible headway can be made: and this means money. Next you have to gather together a band of ardent men with aptitude for the task i. e. men with a real love for this kind of labour, which more often yields scant return, with an amount of patience, which is not always

adequately compensated, with a zeal for study in the midst of cares, and with an ardour for search which is not infrequently tantalizing Men who will not care either for the encomium of the benevolent or the calumny of the slanderer and whose only reward is the joy inherent in the discovery of truth, will indeed be not many. Last, but not the least, is the guidance of an expert who, working along with the apprentice is willing to take him practically through all the varied kind of work involved in research, ranging from the purely mechanical to the highly intellectual. In spite of these difficulties, it appears that the only way of handling the vast mass of South Indian epigraphs, tens of thousands in number, which require the enlistment of the services of a number of men and for which adequate attention is not paid at present, is by the formation of bodies of research scholars and taking up to the work seriously. The publication of volumes of bare texts of inscriptions, can at best be called an attempt to save the impressions secured at some cost from becoming a prey to white ants and rats, and making their contents available to the study of those who know the several languages. Very few would really have been profited by the texts. It is a matter for regret to have bid farewell to the interpretations of the inscriptions. [It is highly necessary not only to revive the old publication of South Indian Inscriptions with translations accompanied by full notes and discussions, but also open the pages of it to receive the contributions from competent scholars and to run it on the same lines as the Epigraphia; the latter publishes in two years something like 35 to 40 articles. In the absence of a government organ devoted exclusively to the scientific interpretations of South Indian inscriptions, it is only private body or bodies that must do it and the ways and means of accomplishing it must be thought out.]

The subject of 'Method of Historic Research' is not one in which novelty of treatment might be expected. It is not my object to point out defects in the system of scientific enquiry that is obtaining in the field of research. I believe that the subject

is one that cannot be too frequently talked about. Like the conning of prayers and the repeating of the sacred injunctions of a teacher to his disciple which act as corrective to the erring humanity, this may serve the useful purpose of reminding one's limitations and latitudes. Sometimes the results obtained in the application of certain dictum or rule might suggest a wholesome change which needs be taken note of. Though the subject is a general one with a wide ground before it, I have thought it fit to confine myself to such aspects of it as are in application by research scholars in the field of Ancient Indian History. The principles that are put forth in this short sketch are those which have been found employed by competent men who have devoted their labours to the cause of research in this line for long years. Some of them may have been anticipated by others more competent to pass opinions in the matter, but it will be conceded readily that we are not barred from passing through the same ground again. Some years ago, in the convocation addresses of our universities, graduates leaving colleges were repeatedly told that a wide field was open to them in the research work of the country and they were exhorted to take it up seriously. That these remarks had not fallen on deaf ears is clearly proved by the fact that we have now quite a good number of them devoting their leisure hours to the pursuit of this work. There are many who evince a strong desire to work in the field, but have not the necessary facilities to carry it out. This is specially the case with all those that are in the mofusal. (The efforts of some show that they do it with little or no method, there being no experts to guide them or set rules to observe).

It has often been said that India has no written history and that the materials for constructing it are scanty. The truth of this statement used to be generally admitted without any reservation. But so far as it relates to South India, it may be said that the remark is not entirely true. The history of the Dekhan is written not in one place, but in hundreds of places; not

in one script but in several ; not in the flimsy perishable pages of paper or parchment but on hard and comparatively more permanent materials such as stone, metals and the like, with such details as could not be traced in the history of any other nation. The monuments of past ages of South India are not either few like those of other countries or for the matter of that, of other parts of our own land. The relics of greatness of our kings and people are scattered over places far and wide, and the triumphs achieved by them in the several departments of life have left unmistakable marks throughout the land. For one who has acquired an insight into the nature of these remains, the moment he steps into an ancient shrine he sees in the very hand of the successive generations of people, certain authentic and trustworthy documents. They reveal the power of the Indian kings, the state of civilisation reached by the people, their occupation, the various institutions of government, the safety of person and property, the taxes raised, the benefits which the people obtained from the rulers, the minute system of land measurement, the net work of their irrigation system, the management of their religious endowments and the like. But these interesting accounts remain a sealed book to most people. To help us in the correct understanding of these records, we have the literature of the people, which supplies valuable information on several important topics connected with history, the writings of foreign travellers, both oriental and occidental. the chronicles of the Singhalese people, the numerous coins which the tilling instruments of the farmer unearth from oblivion and finally the traditional accounts current in the country, which throw a flood of light on the past history of the Dekhan. These auxiliary departments open up fresh fields of enquiry. Such being the case, the general complaint regarding the paucity of materials required for building up the history of the past, though true to a certain extent on account of their being not made available to us, is not valid. There is no room to think that the ground is as barren as it is represented to be. The country is rich in

architectural monuments dating back to very early times, with sculptures of great beauty and skilful workmanship, in coins belonging to various dynasties of kings, in an inexhaustible mine of lithic records which tell the tales of olden times and in an interesting collection of literary works of great merit. Traditions and legends abound and await careful examination. Such and so varied are the materials before the student of Historic Research.]

Even a few years ago, it was believed that in spite of its high Dravidian culture, isolated as South India was from the North by natural barriers which prevented a free communication with it, and from the absence of native chronicles to record the historical events of past times, its history prior to A. D. 1000 had almost perished and that no connected account of the national transactions of South India in early times could be written. Events relating to the kingdoms of the Dekhan for several centuries prior to the 11th have now been unfolded thanks to the exertions of a handful of scholars, and more is being done every day. This leaves little room for such despair now.

Apart from the general interest that the research work affords, there is a special attraction in the investigation about the past of South India. As we turn the leaves of any early work on the subject of history, we find that in the past ages prominence is mostly given to the doings of kings. The life and growth of the nation as well as its social progress are entirely kept in the background. This is justifiable to some extent as the kings were everything in ancient times and the people played an insignificant part in the government of the country. It is only in later times that the nation has organised itself and developed to such an enormous magnitude that it is impossible now to write the modern history of any western country without adequately dealing with the growth of the nation and the progress of the society. On the other hand, [the student of Indian History finds to his surprise that in Ancient India, the king had almost little to do with the internal administration of the country, which was left entirely

to be managed by bodies of learned men who formed the village assembly. It is the doings of those that constitute the history so called of the South.]

[The system of government by assemblies and the representation of the interest of the people in them by members is not peculiar to India alone. Such a mode of rule can be traced in other countries as well. But in India what strikes the historian most is the considerable progress made by these bodies of men from early times and the autonomous power which the people had secured even then. This system which was in vogue in South India in very early ages had continued to hold its own up to very recent times in all parts of the land which had not been affected by foreign contact. The king and his officers — who were also numerous— looked after the collection of taxes, the military and foreign affairs and exercised a sort of appellate authority over the transactions of the popular assemblies. It appears that it was possible, in ancient times, under the system then prevalent, for a ryot to look after his business in the field unmolested even at a time when war was raging in the country. But there are stray instances where an Indian king, not satisfied with the conquests he effected, burnt down villages, allowed plundering and caused misery and annoyance to the people. These facts are traceable in some of the records relating to South India. But these are exceptions and not the rule.]

Inscriptions form the bulk of the material for the reconstruction of the ancient history of the South. Though when considered piece-meal some of these are not comparatively so valuable as individual records found in other parts, yet their importance in giving detailed information on the varied aspects of the life and culture of the people is very great. The lack in the one case is more than compensated by the number which exceeds several times that of any other tract in India or elsewhere.

Unlike most of the inscriptions found in other parts of the country South Indian inscriptions have a peculiar interest to

students of research. As one goes through the ancient lithic monuments of the *Tamil* country, the sentences wherein cover several pages of writing with constant recital of involved lengthy passages laden with clauses and sub-clauses,—verily put in the form of long winding conveyances of modern days,—he meets with stumbling blocks of technical terms, the meanings whereof very often baffle the understanding, the etymology suggesting a sense quite inappropriate for the place and occasion of their use. In some, we have minute descriptions of the official machinery with all its ramifications from the king down to the menial. Some others present fine pictures in attractive colours of the day to day life of all classes of people and a few others give panoramic views of different aspects of Indian culture of past ages. When we peruse the records of the Telugu and Kannada districts, we meet with a profusion of metrical descriptions not only of the kings, his feudal lords, his departmental ministers, and the worthy donors and their accomplished ancestors, but also of the geography of the country and of the matter of fact grants themselves. The inscriptions of the border lands,—such as South Kanara, Malayalam and Vizagapatam, — present boquets of words of philological interest sometimes affording us clues as to wherefrom they were picked, but very often defying any divination of their origin.

As the entire edifice of history is to rest on the strength of the text of the inscriptions, it is but just to insist on bestowing great care on decipherment. Many doubts and difficulties that present themselves at the first reading of inscriptions are removed by happy suggestions arising in the continued study of the same record and sometimes of other allied ones. Older generations had had good schooling in this respect: they copied down Vedic texts and Itihāsas which they held sacred and dear, nay even other works, with such sincerity that we are made to marvel at them. In many cases the neatness of execution leaves nothing to be desired. They took no liberty with texts even when assured of

mistakes. Suggestions of errors were consigned to the margins. How we wish we have the confidence to declare :—

> Yādṛiśam pustakaṁ dṛishṭaṁ tāḍriśaṁ likhitaṁ mayā !
> Yadi śuddhaṁ aśuddhaṁ vā mama dōshō na vidyatē !!

To put it briefly, that transcript which does not reproduce the text with all its faults and mistakes, is not of much value.

As it is the translation that is more often referred to for information, it is indispensible that it must be accurate, literal and intelligible. Where debatable words or passages occur, the rendering must be followed by notes justifying it. Doubtful words and passages, whose meanings are un-intelligible, needs to be noted down and reserved for the determination of their import by comparison with similar ones occurring in others. Inscriptions teem such words. In the determination of the sense of technical terms, etymology by itself has been found to be an unsafe guide. I shall say something about this later on. Abstracts of contents are more often—though not always—an excuse for inability to understand the correct conception of the original, in all its intricasies and details : and an assured rendering of a clearly unintelligible word or passage is liable to do more harm than good. In corrupt texts it is better to point out the real difficulties than slur them over by confident renderings.

Of the several aspects which an inscription presents for study, palaeography *i. e.* the form of writing is one. Since most of the South Indian records are not dated in any particular era, a careful study of the palaeography becomes a necessity. Such a study enables us to fix the approximate period when a record should have been incised on stone or copper. It may not be out of place here to note that there are differences in the writings of two records of the same date even if they come from the same place when the materials on which they are incised are different. The difference in the material accounts for the slight variation in the writing of a copper plate and a stone inscription of the same time.

Again differences in characters are observable between two epigraphs incised on the same material, if they come from different places. This is because the engravers are different. But it must be said that the differences in the writing in all these cases are not such as to mislead one, if he is careful. That variations exist is enough to show that we should bestow serious thought on palaeography. Though palaeography forms a guide to a student in handling documents, too free a use is sometimes made of it. It is therefore necessary to sound a note of caution against such a usage. Let me make the point clear. When a number of records of sure dates had not been obtained, studied and published in any script, it would be absurd to adduce palaeography as a ground for assigning even the approximate period of a record. In the case of a few inscriptions, which furnish astronomical details, it becomes easy to ascertain the exact date, the approximate time being known from palaeographical grounds. A handful of inscriptions with Śaka dates or dated in other known eras are also found and these help us to fix the time of other allied documents.

Palaeography being only a general indicator of time, its province of usefulness is limited. It cannot be too much pressed into service. It seems unsafe to depend solely upon it to determine whether a record is posterior to or anterior to another drawn up almost in similar type. It must first be realised that we have not got access to any original document at all but are only dealing with their copies. Some of what we call 'original or genuine inscriptions' may after all be second or third hand copies. The first copy might have been in the secretariat and the second in the temple treasury or in the safes of the village or district assemblies and these might have been written in the hand of the more literate officials than the inscriptions, which are copies of them and which, as testified to by the remarks occurring at the end of the epigraphs, is the work of scribes (stone masons: *Tachchāchāriyan*) who have learned to incise letters on stone or other materials. The office of scribe was

held hereditarily in ancient days. True that the art of incising, as indeed of other arts, had been carried to excellence. But it does not follow that the scribes as a class were above erring. They were human beings and shared human defects. Generally speaking most of them did their work with sincerity for which they have our admiration. The whole secret about the engraving of inscriptions is still not revealed. In the case of lithic documents, this much may be safely said that the inscription was first written down on stone with a sort of red paint and then they were incised. Whether the engraver himself painted the letters on stone from copies on palm leaves or other materials, or some others did it for them is still an unsolved problem. Our own shortcomings prompt us to be generous enough to allow the same to the poor scribes. (In paranthesis I may add that the very scholars, who had devoted more time than others in tracing and recording the changes which letters had undergone in subsequent periods, have committed shocking blunders in reading inscriptions : this only affords us a warning to be more careful : the mistakes of others serve to correct us.) We have had hundreds and even thousands of inscriptions. I have not met with a single reference anywhere to the forging of documents. It may be admitted that forging might have been attempted to secure title to property. But such could have been easily detected and the criminal brought to book by the system then in vogue, *i. e.* by a reference to the copies preserved and the notes made in the various books of the account departments and in the safes of the assembly or the temple. The absence of references in inscriptions to forgeries seems to indicate that they were rarely attempted. We have numerous references to the taking down of copies of old inscriptions and re-engraving them : but none of forging. Some of the re-engraved inscriptions clearly indicate that those who took down copies of earlier records were not good epigraphists and could not well make out the original : they made several kinds of blunders. On this account, the records are not entitled to be termed 'forgeries' we have no good reasons to spurn them. We

may condemn the copyists for his defects and note the unsound parts. Copies are not bad to be used. Lawyers use copies of depositions taken down by their own men, imperfect though they be. Judges proceed on the contents of certified copies though the certification is only at the end. Want of certification cannot bar the use, if the copies are good.

In any case, every inscription before it is condemned as 'spurious' or 'forged' needs be noted in what parts they are unsound or incapable of credence. If inscriptions could only be termed later copies, whether so specified by the writer or could be so inferred, the grounds for rejecting any part of the information contained in them should be recorded. The detection of a number of evident mistakes of spelling, or the presence of a few mis-shapen letters or the fact that the calligraphy is not of the time to which the record should be attributed on other good grounds, are not sufficient for spurning them.

When I say so much, let it not be understood that I attach no value for palaeography. Far from it. I would only say that it will be unfair to condemn copies of inscriptions or any part of them, without sufficient grounds.

It has been the rule in our country that all public documents should first receive the assent of the king before the transactions contained in them are engraved on stone or copper, the object of such engraving being to prevent any misuse of the original intentions. It may be said that both the people and the officers of government were guided by these documents in ancient times. Naturally therefore they often bear the regnal years of the kings and a short description of their achievements. The historical introductions furnished in inscriptions are of value to us for the construction of the political history. If the record is one on copper, it bears even the seal of the king. While utilising the information contained in inscriptions which do not bear the proper name of the king but only the title, one had to

be very careful because it was customary in those days for sovereigns to assume certain titles by which they were known in common with a few others. To give an example, the Chōḷa kings bore the titles Rājakēsari and Parākēsari alternately. Similarly the Pāṇḍyas had the titles Mārañjaḍaiyan and Saḍayamāran, the Rāshṭrakūṭas Akālavarsha etc. Very often even a name was borne by more than one sovereign of a single dynasty just as there are Edwards, Georges and Henrys, there were Rājarājas, Rājēndrachōḷas, Kṛishṇas, Gōvindas and Narasiṁhas. It becomes sometimes difficult to determine to which particular king of that name the record must be relegated. In the accounts of the sovereigns, we meet with the names of contemporary kings which were also borne by more persons than one. The identifications have to be effected with care.

Inscriptions furnish valuable information regarding the ancient geography of the country. Numerous villages are mentioned as being situated in districts: and the divisions to which the latter belonged are also given. By collecting together the villages and identifying them, we can determine the extent of districts and divisions that were comprised in a particular province (*maṇḍala*). As a rule, each provincial chief had a capital city or cities, one or more *nāḍus* and a hill. Generally the ancient names of villages and provinces did not undergo any change even though they were conquered by neighbouring kings and invested with duplicate names. Wars were numerous and they were undertaken to establish the supremacy of kings, but not necessarily for annexation. Once an enmity is created, it continued for years with varying successes. The injunctions of Dharmaśāstras ,—*viz*, that war must be had recourse to as the last resort when the three expedients failed, and that when the conquest is effected, the territory must be left in charge of a member of the vanquished monarch,—give room for holding that the ancient kingdoms remained unaffected by the results of war. Limits of kingdoms must have changed. Annexation of territories seldom occurred : and even when they occurred, it

did not affect the geography of the place. Sometimes the conquerors,—mostly the Pallavas and Chōḷas,—gave fresh names to villages and provinces which they overcame, but these did not replace the older names but were added to them to indicate by the mere mention of the names with the surnames, to whom or which country the places originally belonged and who acquired it in later times. The conquerors themselves took care to preserve the ancient territorial names. There is good scope for making out the ancient geography and it is a field in which much has not been yet done. Hills, rivers or streams, sea-coasts and such other natural objects mostly mark the limits of the districts and divisions. Inscriptions afford unerring clues in some instances, to where we could locate some of the rare mountains, rivers and *tīrthas*. For instance if we take into consideration the fact that a territorial magnate of the time of the Pallava king Mahēndravarman I was styled *sitētara Beṇṇānātha* and *Trikūṭaparvatapati*, we could say that Trikūṭaparvata must be in the region of the Kṛishṇā river. Though Beṇṇā or Vēṇī was the name of one of the tributaries of the Gōdāvarī, it is excluded by the fact of the application of the epithet *sitētara*. A study of the later appellations given to places sometimes enables us to say when a conquest of a territory should have been effected. It will also help us in fixing the surnames of kings. In the heart of the Chōḷa dominions we find villages bearing the surnames Siṁhavishṇu-Chaturvēdimaṅgalam, Mahēndramaṅgalam and Narasiṁhachaturvēdimaṅgalam, and a temple called Pallavanichchuram so early as to be celebrated in the hymns of a Śaiva saint of the 7th century A.D. The earliest name Siṁhavishṇuchaturvēdimaṅgalam indicates that Siṁhavishṇu must have conquered the Chōḷa country. The Vēlūrpālayam plates actually tell us that he did so.

About the language of inscriptions and its attractions for the research student much could be said. The correct understanding and interpretation of the various subjects treated in inscriptions demand from the student a wide range of study. At least, he is

forced to learn many things from many sources as occasions arise. The lover of literature can find here many a forgotten worthy who could take honourable places among the galaxy of writers. A lover of writing can easily pick numerous fine passages, telling expressions and good models of easy flowing, direct and forceful narrations. A conveyancer without effort, can make a reference book of various kinds of instruments. A lexicographer can collect hundreds of new words. The philologists and etymologists have a wide field to display their skill of interpreting and to make note of curiosities of changes of words And those who are interested in the study of the nature and function of the ancient institutions which are but meagerly noticed in the Hindu Dharmaśāstras will have full scope here. The administrator, if he is curious, can find here how State problems relating to Health and Sanitation, Co-operation and Rural Banking, Education, Town-Planning, Maintenance of Law and Order, Irrigation and the like, had been solved by the ancients in this land of various nationalities and various creeds. When I recount to you that the subjects treated in inscriptions are so many and so varied, you will certainly know how the research student should equip himself to do full justice to the task before him. He will not think that he has done his work satisfactorily by carefully deciphering the heiroglyphic of inscriptions, translating as best as he could or giving an abstract of contents, and by handling a few facts revealed in them concerning the transactions of kings.

A research scholar has before him a good number of valuable documents of various nature which require his careful handling. He cannot afford to treat lightly even a single record however small or trifling its contents may be. It is expected that he would bestow the same consideration to this as he would tc the one furnishing much interesting matter.

It is within our knowledge that differences of opinion are entertained even by experts as regards the matter contained in

documents. While one calls it a conveyance, another gives considerations for taking the same for an agreement and the third holds that it is a bond or mortgage. The same is the case with some inscriptions. As the bulk of the material, both literary and epigraphical, which relate to South India, is in one or other of the Dravidian languages, any one who wants to handle these inscriptions, if he should at all make a judicious and correct use of these, a knowledge of the Dravidian languages should possess. Not only should he be conversant with the literary form of them but must know well the colloquial forms used in the daily life of the people and that employed in documentary scrolls.

Before the historian makes use of the contents of a document it is incumbent that he should see whether they are authentic in themselves. Here I may note that there is less chance of tampering with lithic records than those on copper plates, because the latter are in the custody of persons who could at their leisure effect any secret mischief to suit their purpose. There is little room to do the same with stone records kept in public places like the temple or other monuments. Generally speaking, therefore, better reliance could be placed on this class of documents.

Inscriptions when they are dated in any particular era *e. g.* Śaka, Vikrama, Kollam etc. coupled with cyclic years, it must be seen whether the latter correspond to the former. When these are found to be widely at variance, there is an indication that some time must have elapsed between the actual date of the grant and the time of incising and more care must be bestowed regarding their dates. The form of the language and the terms used in the documents, if properly studied, would also furnish clues to test if they are distant copies. A close study of the characters of the records will also be of immense help in this direction. For example, if an inscription which pretends to belong to an early period is written in the script of a later date, unquestionably it is a copy. A careful examination of the signatories, who would in most cases be officers of kings, would also enable one to find out if a document

is genuine or not. Even when the documents are found to disclose discrepancies in some respects, they cannot, on that score alone, be rejected or despised as worthless. An endeavour should be made to ascertain if other parts of them are sound. Inscriptions in which the date portion is clearly wrong are not rare. Many of them, which furnish astronomical details, have on verification been found to be incorrect, and yet we have no reason to doubt their authenticity, the errors in these cases being due to the carelessness of the scribes. In spurious records generally, the unreliable portions are those relating to grants. The geographical description given in them, if they are not far distant from the dates of issue, need not be looked upon as incredible or valueless. The historical facts noticed in such documents have to be subjected to scrutiny.

One other point to which attention may be drawn is the verification of the astronomical details of dates furnished in inscriptions. These details consist in the insertion of what are called the *pañchāṅga* or the five elements viz. the constellation, the week day, the *tithi*, the fortnight and the month. Given these, it is possible to work out the particular day when they occurred combined. Very often we may find that on more than one day such combinations occurred. In such cases the calculator has very onerous duties. He should not be led away by the thought that because the details work out accurately to a particular day, that day must be the one intended. He must always take the guidance of the palaeographical indications of the record and its internal evidence to ascertain the correctness of his finding. To give currency to the results of calculations which are widely at variance with the internal evidence of documents is to give a wrong lead to occurrence of events. It must be said that a small mistake on the part of the writer of a document might result in its anti-dating or post-dating. Usually and necessarily some time elapses between the actual date of the grant and its engraving. This gives room to inaccurate citation of details. It is therefore highly necessary to give due weight to the intrinsic evidences of documents other than the details of dates.

I may here give an instance where the historian has been misled from the true course of events, by not having paid due attention to the evidence of writing. One such is found in the attempts at fixing the commencement of the Gāṅgēya Era. The initial year of this Era has been sought in the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D. Just imagine how wide of the mark the transactions of the kings of the dynasty would be, if they are based on such chronology, while actually the Era could not have started earlier than the end of the 5th century as indicated by the palaeography of many of the Eastern Gaṅga grants.

A close observation and study of the regnal years show that the kings of the various dynasties of South India counted the time of their rule from the date of their anointment as *yuvarāja i.e.* from the date of their nomination and not from the day of their actual coronation. Generally the *yauvarājya abhishēka* took place when the reigning king was getting old and the one that was to succeed him was sufficiently aged.

If a reigning king was young and hale and died suddenly, or if he was old and the one to be nominated was too young to be invested with the authority of a *yuvarāja*, the nomination did not take place. The regnal years of such kings as had succeeded to the throne without having had the *yauvarājya abhishēka* would be counted from the date of their actual coronation or from the date of demise of their predecessor. Though the regnal years given in inscriptions are, as a general rule, calculated from the date of nomination, we do meet with instances where some of the regnal years are counted from the coronation date and some others from the nomination date. On this score also, it becomes necessary to examine, wherever possible, whether the year is counted from the date of demise of the predecessor or from a prior date. Otherwise wide differences in the dating of events might result : and I mention this so that a possible source of error might be avoided. In the last few years of the Eastern Gaṅga Anantavarman Chōḍagaṅga and the Rāshṭrakūṭa Amōghavarsha I, both of whom

had lived to a pretty long age, there are evidences that their sons were allowed to issue records in their own names even during the lifetime of their father.

There are numerous instances in inscriptions which tend to show that feudal subordinates dated their records in the reign of their overlords. From the mere omission of this observance alone it would be gratuitous to infer that a particular feudatory threw off his subordination and aimed at independence or rebelled against his chief, which he might never even have imagined. It will be advisable in all cases where a suspicion of this nature arises, to seek for other proofs in the direction, since it is not known what exactly were the terms that were binding. If, in a tract of country where grants are dated in the reign of a ruling dynasty of kings, suddenly stray inscriptions turn up which are dated in Śaka or other known eras and no mention is made of any king, and there is no suspicion about their genuineness, an enquiry needs be made for the breach of the custom. It may sometimes lead to the conclusion that the country was at the time in the state of transition from one government to another.

If in the course of handling documents, we meet with damaged or unintelligible records, it is unfair to attempt at pronouncing findings with the aid of intelligible phrases or words picked up here and there from them. And if the information furnished by us is to be of any real use for purposes of history, the utmost that can be safely hazarded is the honest narration of ascertained facts with such judicious pronouncement on them as may be necessary in the form in which the facts are arranged for presentation. All endeavour should be made to resist the temptation to draw inferences or to arrive at general conclusions from isolated or mutilated facts because conclusions formed without sufficient evidence seldom prove correct while the currency which they gain is detrimental to the cause of history. It is highly necessary therefore that we should endeavour to collect all the evidences both for and against, available on the subject, weigh them well and come to a

or of such others whose entire institutions and civilisations had been overthrown and supplanted by conquests. In fact the warning may be said to be the outcome of the study of the constitutions that had been undergoing changes by stress of events—internal and external. It is hardly necessary in a country like India, where the laws governing the course of conduct of its rulers and of the institutions under them, had been firmly laid down in the Smṛitis with the injunction that no infringement of it should be made either by the king or his subjects. This is specially so with reference to the study of the Indian constitution of any period subsequent to the Smṛitis for no changes of them are countenanced by the laws of the land: and no dynasty of kings ever professed other creeds and other laws than are of an indigenous nature. This is particularly the case with South India. Surely there were waves of foreign invasions but it may be observed that they did not leave behind them any permanent change in the existing systems. In order that such a caution may have practical weight, it must be advanced after a careful study of the institutions century by century and after showing the changes for each century. Not only is this not the case, but an examination of the writings of those who sound the note of warnings shows that the warning is honoured more in the breach than in its observance.

To appraise the true nature and function of the constitutional bodies that are mentioned in early inscriptions, a correct knowledge of the Smṛitis is indispensable. But as the texts of the latter which refer to these bodies are clothed in a language which is not easy of grasp and the translations of them, however carefully made, are misleading, we have to approach the texts themselves and try to unravel their mystry by the aid of the inscriptions which belong to a time when the laws of the Smṛitis were in application. Inscriptions and Smṛitis are inter-related to each other and either of them might be reasonably expected to throw light on the other. On account of the misconceptions that are entertained about the origin and composition of some of the village assemblies

viz. (1) that the *Ūr* or *Crāma* was the earliest and a remnant of an ancient Dravidian institution having no set of rules (2) that Sabhā had a later origin,--some would even date it in the 9th, 10th centuries A. D.,—and its members were of mixed classes and the like.

I shall try to show how such views, besides being untenable, are injurious to the very cause of research. The attempt will also prove how invaluable inscriptions are for the understanding of the Smṛiti texts, which they closely follow. The first thing to note is the claim of numerous Indian kings, South Indians not excepted, to have followed the laws of Dharma as inculcated by Manu ; and the next point to note is that the word Dharma has a very wide significance not necessarily limited to Justice or Law, but embraces every kind of transaction that contributes to benefit, Writers on *Dharmas'āstras* recognise two kinds of *dharmas* by which are meant laws, regulations and transactions. These are *Rājakṛita-dharma* or the regulations etc., made by kings, and *Sāmayika* and *Samaya-dharma* 'the regulations etc.,' made by regularly constituted bodies Of such constituted bodies mention is made of Kula, Grāma, Jāti, Śrēṇi, Janapada and Pūga. These were of various degrees of importance and magnitude. The transactions made by them must be in conformity with the Vedas. *Kuḷa* is defined as '*Jñāti-sambandhi bandhūnām samūhaḥ*' *i.e.* the assembly of persons related to each other by the father's or mother's side and by marriages— agnates, kinsmen and cognates. *Grāma* is the constituted assembly of the village. *Jāti* is defined by Kulluka Bhaṭṭa as *Brāhmaṇa-samūhaḥ*, the assembly of Brahmins. The persons, that followed trade as their profession, had two kinds of assemblies which were termed *Śrēṇi* and *Pūga*. Of these, Śrēṇi is also called Sangha and it is defined as *Vaṇigādi-samūhaḥ* i.e. a guild of merchants. A more explanatory definition of it is given in the Mitākṣhara: *Śrēṇayōnānājātīnām ēka-jātīya-karmōpajīvināṁ saṅghātāḥ yathā hēḍabukādīnāṁ tāmbūlika-kuvinda-charma-kārādīnāṁ cha*", meaning Śrēṇis are bodies of men of different castes having for their living *i.e.* following the

calling of one caste like that of horse-dealers, betel-leaf vendors, weavers and shoe-makers. In another place the same commentator has '*Ēkapaṇya-s'ilpajīvinaḥ Śrēṇayaḥ*'. *Pūga* is also termed *Gaṇa* (*Gaṇas'abdaḥ pūga paryāyaḥ*). *Pugas* are defined in the *Mitākshara* as '*Pūgāḥ samūhāḥ bhinna-jātīnāṁ bhinna-vṛittīnāṁ ēka-sthāna-nivāsinām yathā grāma-nagarādayaḥ*' meaning that *pūgas* are assemblies of men of different castes following different avocations but living in a single locality for example a village or city. From this definition it might be said that each of the different classes of merchants and traders had an organisation of its own and all of them were subject to a central constitution. *Janapada* is the assembly of a Rāshṭra or Vishaya, District or division. From the definitions given above it will be clear that *grāma, jāti, janapada* or *dēs'a, saṅgha* or *s'rēṇi* etc., were really names of regularly constituted bodies functioning in ancient times and it is also evident by such references as *jāti-jānapadān dharmān, grāma-jāti-saṅghānām, grāma-jāti-samūhēshu, dēśa-jāti-kula-dharmān* occurring in Manu, Gautama and others. Tamil inscriptions use the term *ūr* for *grāma, sabhā* for *jāti, nāḍu* for *janapada, rāshṭra* or *dēśa* and *nagara, nagarattār, vaṇiga-nagarattār* or *sankarappāḍiyār, etc.* for *Śrēṇi* or *Pūga*. The definitions cited above make it clear that the three constitutional bodies *kula, grāma* and *jāti*, of which the last two stand for *ūr* and *sabhā* were of a homogeneous nature, while the others *Śrēṇi, Pūga* and *janapada* which are the same as *nagara* and *nāḍu* or *Rāshṭra* were of a mixed character. Inscriptions of Southern India afford ample evidence to the fact that allotments of different or distinct quarters were made for the various classes and castes of men, artisans, persons following different professions and industries and that these had corporate bodies of their own which sometimes took up the management of, or assigned fees leviable on articles of trade as funds for charitable or religious purposes. The constitutional character of the bodies is testified to first by the fact that they undertook the management of permanent endowments and gave agreements to the effect that they would carry out the wish

of the donors for an indefinite period of time—*chandrādityavat*—which no private individual or chance collection of men acting without any set rules could furnish to the satisfaction of the donees; secondly by the body having members of their own; thirdly by the mention made of the existence of committees and accountants under them proving that books, open for inspection when needed, were regularly maintained by them.

Hundreds of inscriptions testify to the fact that these bodies,—*Ūr, Sabhā, Nagarattār*,—were functioning quite independently without the intervention of the State: the only thing required was, as we gather from the Smṛitis that their actions must be in consonance with the injunctions of the Vēdas and Śāstras *i. e.* the ancient law codes of the country. It is in keeping with this that the Dharma-śāstrās tell us that the king and his men should not interfere with or institute a case with reference to these bodies on their own initiative: and that when cases were brought they must enforce the laws etc. of the bodies provided they are regular, in as good a way as they would enforce the royal orders.

Yājña: Nija-dharm-āvirōdhēna yas-tu sāmayikō bhavēt ı
Sōspi yatnēna saṁrakṣhyō dharmō Rājakṛitaścha yaḥ ıı

Manu: Jāti-jānapadān dharmān Śrēṇi-dharmāṁścha dharmavit ı
Samīkshya-Kula-dharmāṁścha svadharmaṁ pratipādayēt ıı

Sadbhirācharitaṁ yat syāt dhārmikaiścha dvijātibhiḥ ı
Taddēśa-kula-jātīnāṁ aviruddhaṁ prakalpayēt ıı

Gautama: Dēśa-Jāti-Kula-Dharmāścha āmnāyair aviruddhāḥ pramāṇaṁ

Every kind of transaction made by the bodies—*Ūr, Sabhā, Nagara* whether it be a gift, exemption from payment of tax on receipt from the donee of a compounding fee, law, regulation etc., is called in inscriptions by the terms *kārya, samayakārya, saṅkēta, samaya-saṅkēta* and *vyavasthā*. These terms are applied to the

transactions performed by the bodies collectively and not by any single individual. The point for particular note here is that the terms *saṅkēta* and *samayakārya* and their synonyms have no reference whatsoever to the rules relating to the constituting of the bodies *i. e.* the form of understanding that must have existed among the members or to any agreed creed among them. We draw special attention to this as, in the absence of the specific application in inscriptions, they are likely to be so understood.[1]

You can find numerous kinds of mistakes committed in the translations of texts of Dharmaśāstras, employing these technical terms. The members of the constitutional bodies are sometimes called Saṅkētins or Samayasaṅkētins. But generally they are called perumakkaḷ in Tamil, pramukhas or mahājanas in Sanskrit, Kannaḍa and Telugu inscriptions, with the name of the body prefixed to their honorifics such as ūr-perumakkaḷ, sabhai-pperumakkaḷ, Rāshṭrakūta-pramukhas or Nāṭṭu-pperumakkaḷ. Dharmaśāstras term them *mukhyas* (*e.g Mukhyaiṣ-saha samūhānām visaṁvādō yadā bhavēt, tadā vichārayēt rājā svadharme sthāpayechcha tān*).

The law relating to the infringement of the regulations or transactions of the bodies is called Samvid-vyatikrama and it is shortly told in three verses by Manu,[2] from which it could be

---

[1] Bṛihaspati : Grāma–Śrēṇi–Gaṇanāñcha Saṅkētāḥ Samayakriyā ।
Bādhā-kālē tu sā kāryā Dharmakāryē tathaiva cha ॥
Chāṭa–chaura–bhayē bādhāḥ sarva–sādhāraṇāḥ smṛitāḥ ।
Tatrōpaśamanam kāryam sarvēṇaikēna kēna chit ॥

[2] Yō grāma-dēśa-saṅghānāṁ kṛitvā satyēna saṁvidam
Visaṁvadēt narō lobhāt tāṁ rāshṭrāt viprāvasayēt 219
Nigṛihya dāpayēch-chainaṁ Samaya-vyabhichāriṇām
Chatus-suvarṇān shaṇ-nishkāṁs-chatamānaṁ-cha rājatām 220
Ētad-daṇḍavidhim kuryād-dhārmikaḥ pṛithivīpatiḥ
Grāma-jāti-samūhēṣhu samayavyabhichāriṇām 221

gathered that the king's court is the appellate authority in such cases. Manu makes a distinction between a royal court presided over by the king himself and the one presided over by his nominee when he could not himself be present. The latter is called the *Dharmāsana*. This implied but apparent distinction is made more explicit by Nārada who states that there is an appeal to the king against the decision of the other (*'nṛipādhikṛitaiḥ nirṇītē api vyavahārē nṛipāgamanam bhavati*). Inscriptions also maintain this distinction and mention the former as *anrāḷkō* 'the then reigning king' and the latter by the very term *dharmāsana*. Though the king is empowered, in cases of *samvid-vyati-krama*, to inflict punishment on the guilty, he has to enforce only the laws of the bodies if they are found to be in accordance with the established laws of the country.

In handling inscriptions, one has frequently to press into service the science of etymology and philology. This is often beset with difficulties: and if he is not careful, he will be led astray. The ancients well recognised the delicate nature of the science and the harm it was capable of doing to the cause of truth. The author of the Nirukta fitly employed the following passage to impress on the minds of the votaries of the science how dangerous it will prove in the hands of the unscrupulous:—

Vidyā ha vai Brāhmaṇaṁ ājagāma gōpāya mā śēvadhishṭē aham asmi ।
Asūyakāyānṛijavē ayatāya na mā brūyā vīryavatī tathā-syāṁ ।
Ya ātṛṇatty-avitathēna karṇāvaduhām kurvann-amṛitaṁ samprayachchhan ।
Taṁ manyēta pitaraṁ mātaraṁ cha tasmai na druhyēt katamachchanāha ।
Adhyāpitā yē guruṁ nādriyantē viprā vāchā manasā karmaṇā vā ।
Yathaiva tēna gurōrbhōjanīyās tathaiva tānnabhunakti śrutaṁ tat ।

Yamēva vidyāḥ śuchiṁ apramattaṁ mēdhāvinaṁ
brahmacharyōpapannaṁ
Yastēna druhyēt katamachchanāha tasmaẏmā brūya nidhipāya
Brahmann iti nidhiḥ śēvadhiriti
(Nr. II·4)

" The treasure of Vidyā approached a Brāhmaṇa and said :—

" Please protect me and bestow me not on the envious or the untruthful or on one that is wanting in industry. Pray consider as father and mother him who, without being vain, opens his ears to others, causes no injury and is capable of conferring immortality; to such a one prove not treacherous to any extent. (Those Vipras who after being taught, do not honour the preceptor by word, mind and action, should not be entertained; should just do unto them what they had done to their preceptors.)" "Lastly," said the treasure of Vidyā, "bestow me on such a protector of wealth as is pure in conduct, as swerves not from the right path, as is intelligent and leads a life of celebacy".

The remarks of Yāska on the use of the science are well worth remembering. Yāska takes his stand on the fundamental principle that there could exist no word without having a meaning. And words are but feeble attempts at conveying one's impressions. To translate an impression, which is a vivid picture formed in the mind with fullness of detail, no single word or sound-combination could effectively do it. Words try to convey their significance by creating a reflection of the impressions: and the power of reflection, it is needless to say, is different in different minds. It varies with one's learning, observation, capacity to focus together the train of thoughts which supplement and complement the necleus of the first impression produced by the word. To most people a word conveys no more than a few parts of the objects with which they are familiar and certainly that is not all that the word intends to transmit. It cannot be said that all know in an equal degree every part of even the most familiar object. The story of the blind man and the elephant may perhaps better illustrate what I aim at saying. Conscious of the fact that

words are by their syllabic arrangements, capable of conveying impressions of objects, Yāska lays down the rules which must guide an etymologist in determining or explaining the impression meant to be conveyed. His first principle is that attempts at offering etymological explanations of words must only be made by taking compounds, phrases or sentences where they occur and not of single or isolated words (*samāsān-nirbrūyāt naikapadāni*). Underlying this principle, one can see that he fully recognises the fact that a word, as it occurs in a phrase or compound, fulfills a double object viz. of its having an impression of its own and of bearing a relation to the impressions conveyed by other words with which it is associated. For ascertaining conclusively the import of a word it may not do to have only a single phrase or sentence in which it is found: very often the syllables of a word are capable of conveying more than one meaning. As such one of the qualifications of a true etymologist is a wide range of study which would enable him to bring together a number of passages where a given word figures. This is exactly what Yāska does in his Nirukta with regard to some words. Secondly Yāska expects an etymologist to have a knowledge of grammer for he says that this science should not be imparted to one that is not conversant with grammer (*na avaiyākaraṇāya*). Unlike English and such other languages, which use separate words for indicating various cases of nouns, tenses of verbs etc., the primary stems of words in the Ārsha, as indeed with all inflectional languages such as Latin, Greek, Tamil etc., undergo vital changes by the addition of terminations, prefixes and particles, besides other internal alterations, so as to make the words assume in some cases entirely new garbs, easily to be mistaken for words of different origin. Even though one is well grounded in grammer, a student of etymology requires, according to Yāska, the personal direction of a master and has therefore to undergo training in the mysteries in this field of research and inquiry, by being a disciple. Mere formulation of rules for guidance was not

considered enough owing to the many pitfalls that are likely to occur. This is what one might gather when he says *na anupāsannāya.* Ignorance breeds envy and calumny and this science is not for the ignorant. On the other hand, it has to be taught to the intelligent, industrious, and such as value knowledge (Nr. II·3)

Nityam hi avijñātuḥ vijñānē asūyā

Upasannāya tu nirbrūyāt yo vālam vijñātum syāt medhāvine tapasvine vā

The drawing of correct inferences and conclusions is not easy. Just to give you an example, I may take the view about the state of Vedic exegisis in past ages. Not a few are inclined to think that it was totally disregarded from the earliest times. That the holders of this view are to no small extent influenced by the surrounding circumstances goes without saying. The conclusions, arrived at in this respect are from certain passages in the Nirukta and the scant treatment of Vedic grammer in Pāṇini. The former is not decisive either way and as for the latter, it may be said that it cannot but be as it is. Epigraphical evidence clearly shows that all through the period covered by the inscriptions, the study of the Vedas with meaning was pursued zealously.

Belonging to the century preceding the advent of Sāyaṇa there are numerous copper plates and lithic records which register *brahmadēya* grants of lands and villages, made not only to individuals but also to collections of men. The collection in one case amounted to as many as thousand and eighty persons. These men are expressly stated to have been well versed in the Vedas and Śāstras, studied them with meaning and were capable of expounding them. The words used are *Vēdamum—Sāstramum porutpaḍappoy vyākyātakkaṭay irukhum.* Number of other inscriptions belonging to earlier period also testify to the fact that there were men who had studied the Vedas with meaning and were skilled in the allied lore. Among the qualifications laid down in

the Uttaramallur inscriptions for membership in the committees of the village assemblies which had for their object *dushṭar keṭṭu śishṭar varddhittiḍuvadāga*, whose full significance had not still been brought out, there occur the following. (i) *Mantra-brāhmaṇam vallān ōduvittarivān* and (ii) *araikkāl nilamēy uḍaiyanāyilum oru Vēdam vallanāy nālu bāshyattilum oru bāshyam vakkānittu arivānai.* The first clause means "one who had marked the *Mantra—Brāhmaṇa* had taught it and knew it" *i.e.* its meaning): It cannot be said that 'know it' stands for 'committed to memory' for the latter sense is already arranged by the word 'vallānay'.

The words used here leave no doubt that the members eligible to be committee members ought to have known the meanings of Vēdas/Mantras, and ought to have been teaching them. We need not go into a discussion about this. The second clause relaxes the property limit in the case of persons who knew one of the four Bashyas and had been expounding the same. From these clauses and from the fact that the members chosen for a particular year should not have served on the committees within the three years just preceding the year of election, aimed at giving scope for all, and of raising the standard of Vedic scholarship of the people of the village in general. One of the objects of the edict *viz* 'that the 'sishṭas may increase in number' is certainly better secured by the more explicit clauses in the second edict which replace the general clause regarding educational qualification of the first inscription, and by the clauses relating to the conduct *etc.* of the said persons: *arthas'aucha*, *ātmas'aucha* and *kārya-naipuṇya.* Though there had been no occasion for putting up such edicts concerning other villages, where such committees had been functioning, we could well imagine that the same or similar rules obtained there also. Having the specific qualifications before us, it can be asserted that by *sishtas* are meant such persons as possessed the qualifications laid down in the *Dharmasāstras* viz.

Dharmeṇādhigato yaistu Vēdaḥ saparibṛihmaṇaḥ ।
Tē śishṭā brāhmaṇ ājñēyāh śruti pratyaksha hētavḥ ॥

Kulluka-Bhatta gives the following gloss on it.

Brahmacharyādi ukta dharmēṇa yaih anga—Mīmāṁsā—Dharma-śāstra—Purāṇādi Upabṛiṁhitō Vēdō adhigataḥ Tē brāhmaṇāh Śrutēḥ Pratyakshīkaraṇē hētavaḥ, Yē Śrutim paṭhitvā tad artham upadiśanti tē śishṭā vijñēyāḥ.
(Manu XII. v. 109).

In earlier times Vedic exegesis must have fared even better.

It commenced in a remote past when the Ṛishîs of old, who had direct perception of the dharma, expounded the *mantras* to their disciples who had not such a perception. This is plain from the following passage of the *Nirukta*.

Sākshāt-kṛita-dharmāṇaḥ Ṛishayō babhūvuḥ । tē (=ऽ) varēbhyō (=ऽ) sākshāt kṛita dharmabhyaḥ upadēśēna mantrān samprāduḥ । upadēśāya glāyanto [ऽ] varē bilma grahaṇāyēmam grantham samāmnāsishuḥ Vēdaṁ cha Vēdāṅgāni cha ।
Nirukta ; Canto I ; ll. 27-29.

In these ages, persons that studied the Vēdas without knowing their meaning were held in great contempt. Indeed strong language was employed to denounce such as took to the method of cramming the hymns without knowing their sense.

Sthāṇurayam bhāra-hāraḥ kilābhūdadhītya Vēdaṁ na vijānāti yōऽrtham ; yōऽrthajña it sakalaṁ bhadramaśnutē nākamēti jñāna-vidhūta-pāpmā ; yad-gṛihītamavijñātaṁ nigadēna ēva śabdyatē anagnāv-iva śushkaidhō na taj-jvalati karhichit ;

Utatvaḥ paśyan na dadarśa vāchamutatvaḥ śṛiṇvan na śṛiṇōty-ēnām utōtvasmai tanvaṁ visasrē jāy-ēva patya uśatī suvāsāḥ ; । utatvaṁ sakhyē sthira-pītamāhurnainaṁ hinvantyapi vājinēshu ; । adhēnvā charati māyayaisha vāchaṁ śuśruvāṁ a-phalāma-pushpām.॥ Nr. I. 11-20.

The emphasis laid in the above quotation on knowing the meaning of the Vēdas and the contempt hurled against persons

studying only the Vedic texts without caring for the sense implied therein, coupled with the fact that the Ṛishis themselves initiated their disciples in the import of the mantras, affords room to think that the majority of students should have known the full significance of hymns they learnt to recite. That the Ṛishis had their *āśramas* and *samhatis* which nestled in their fold large number of disciples is vouchsafed in numerous references. It may be said that the Samhatis formed our universities of outstanding merit and must have been resorted to by the students of the surrounding parts to devote the first part of their life; and this must account for their numerical strength. Besides, the parting injunction of the *āchārya* to the disciple at the time of the latter's completion of study, contained in the telling passage "Vēdamanūchyāchāryāntēvāsināmanuśāsti" ending with "ēvamupāsitavyam" insisting among other things the continuance of the study and exposition of the Vedas all through one's life goes to show that Vedic exegesis could not have been neglected in ancient days. The second stage in the matter of Vedic exegesis is portrayed in the following passage occurring in the Nirukta:—

"Ayaṁ mantr-ārtha-chintā abhyūhō abhyūḍhō Śṛutitō'pi tarkatō; na tu prathaktvēna mantrā nirvaktavyāḥ prakārēṇa stēn ēva tu nirvaktavyā na hi ēsha pratyaksham asti an-Ṛishēr-a-tapasō vā; pārōvaryavitsu tu khalu vēditṛishu bhūyō vidyah praśasyō bhavati ity-uktam purastāt. Manushyā vā Ṛishishu utkrāmatsu dēvān abruvan "Kō na Ṛishir-bhavishyati-iti tébhya ēvaṁ tarkam Ṛishiṁ prayachchhan, mantr-ārtha-chintā abhyūham adhyūḍham. tasmādyad-ēva kiṁch anūchānō abhyūhatyārshaṁ tad bhavati.

In this age the sense of hymns was ascertained by way of right conjecture or inference following a course of reasoning consistent with Śrutis by persons who had undergone a period of monastic life and who were well posted in traditions. The words used here for theVedic expounder and the method of the exegesis

are worth noting. By *anūchana*, we learn that the exegetes was an *antēvāsin* that had gone through a regular course of discipline and read for a number of years the *Vēdas* with their *aṅgas* under the guidance of an âchārya; and having completed the studies had been permitted to enter the *gṛihasthāśhrama:* (*Sāṅgē "Śikshādy-aṅgōpētē Vēdē adhītē* kṛit-âdhyayanō anūchānāsākshād-yō gṛiha-sthādy-āśramāntara-prāptayē labdhānu-jnānaḥ sa samāvrita syāt": (Amara). The word *tarka* refers to the science of logical reasoning in accordance with the orthodox method, *mīmāmsā-nyāya* as it is termed. What is contained in the *nirukta* passage quoted above is put in the following two verses by Manu[1] :—

> Ārshaṁ dharmōpadēśam cha Vēda-Śāstr-āvirōdhinā-yas-tarkēṇ-anusandhattē sa dharmaṁ vēda nētaraḥ I
> Dharmēṇ-ādhigatō yaistu Vēdaḥ sa-pari-bṛihmitaḥ tē sishṭā Brāhmaṇāḥ jñēyāḥ Śṛuti-pratyaksha-hētavaḥ.

Now to the minor sources of information. Every nation has a store-house of legends, miracles, fables and traditions which when examined carefully disclose points of striking similarity. Legends and traditions have as their basis nuclii of facts, though in their details they are completely untrustworthy for purposes of history. A careful examination of them is necessary to find out the central fact on which the legends are developed, for facts however trifling they may be, do not deserve to be discarded. The South is specially rich in miracles said to have been wrought by many a great man who appeared on the scene of life in different ages and left behind him the undying monumental labours of his life. Such are the actions attributed to the 63 Śaiva devotees, the 12 Alwars and the bhaktas who followed in their wake. When we proceed to examine the incidents connected with the lives of these great personages we find that some parts of them are highly romantic, some are fabulous and the rest a tissue of miracles. On this score they cannot be rejected without any

1 Kullūka-Bhatta's comment on V. 106 of Ch. XII. and Ch. XII. Vv. 106-109. *Ibid.*

enquiry into them. On careful examination one may find that some of them are based on facts as well authenticated as facts of such a kind can be. We can easily persuade ourselves to believe that the miracles attributed to great men have not been actually wrought by them but what successive generations of admirers of their wonderful achievements gradually invested and credited them with fulfilment. In all probability there were floating miracles which the mind of the admirer loved to attribute to particular saints. This, if accepted, would satisfactorily account for the same miracle being associated with more than one person. Attribution of miraculous deeds to persons [illegible] gradually done not during their life-time but some generations after they had passed away.

It is thus helpful in a way to show that some time must have elapsed between the lifetime of the persons and the first mention of them with miraculous attributes. King Kochchengaṇṇan is mentioned in the hymns of Jnānasasbandha as having been a spider in his previous life. This might be taken to show that the Chōḷa king lived some time prior to the sage poet. Miracles themselves have no place in history and are to be rejected without hesitation. Our experience of nature and human capacity is such that we have to view these wonderful stories as being beyond the pale of belief improbable as they are of occurrence. We may quote the words of one of 19th century historians Mr. J. A. Froude who says "Science has less respect for the undoubting and submissive willingness to believe. The element of miracle which has evaporated from the entire surface of history will not maintain itself but will melt like a snow ball." Who among us will believe or take for facts of history that a person was capable of bringing a dead girl to life, made a crocodile to vomit forth the child which it had devoured years ago, or changed a pack of jackals into horses. Though all of us would have discredited without the slightest hesitation the truth of these if they were associated with any foreign nation, yet it is not too much to say that our minds do attach so much importance to these wonderful

achievements, believed to have been performed by some of our great men that we are almost inclined to hold that these miracles are not entirely false. It therefore requires some training and even effort on our part to guard ourselves against erring in this direction. It is easy to be a judge in a case and give correct verdict too when we are not interested in the parties, concerned or the parts played by them.

In the writing of history, especially when it is in the making, it is necessary to cite authority for every bit of what we write. This is the reason why we find the writings of scholars flooded with footnotes. It must be remembered that in failing to do this we commit a grave offence.

A word may now be said about literary evidences. Facts gleaned from literature cannot be regarded as direct evidence, especially when they are taken from poetical works, because they are by their very nature highly coloured by the imagination of the poets. But there are works which though of poetic nature are only so in their form. In the mode of treatment, it appears that this class of works could be relied upon for purposes of history. They seem to contain trustworthy accounts of early kings although they do not throw light as regards the time when they lived or how long they reigned. The student is therefore confronted with difficulties when he attempts to arrange the kings mentioned in them in a chronological sequence. But here we see that the intention of the author is not to display either emotion or the subtlety of their imaginations, but merely to record events and facts as he had occasion to see personally or to hear from authentic sources. One special feature about them is that they are completely void of all poetical embellishments which we find in the later day compositions. (Purananuru, Pattuppattu and the like come under this category). On a perusal of these works, which by the way may be said to be the productions of contemporary bards, will convince any reader that they contain true account of kings & of their times and are as valuable as the sketches of the Greek ambassador Magasthenes and

the Chinese pilgrims Fa Hien and Hieun Tsiang etc. They give us a true picture of the country, the life of the people and their cultural attainments. Some of their faithful descriptions can be verified even at the present day in spite of the changes that have come over the land. Since these are the only sources wherefrom we get a glimpse of the remote past, it is necessary that a proper study of them should be made.

Under the second category must be included such works as Silappadigaram, Manimegalai, Jivakachintāmaṇi, Periyapurāṇam. Tiruviḷaiyāḍalpurāṇam and the like where the authors introduce historical characters here and there and spin out a romantic account mixing up fiction and facts. Large additions are made to excite wonder and interest and miracles are freely introduced. In using the materials supplied in such works for purposes of history one has to be extremely cautious. These materials have to be subjected to severe scrutiny and only such parts of them as are capable of verification from other sources can be considered true. It may be said that the authors of these works cannot be regarded as contemporaries of the historical personages found in these works.

The third class of works introduce fictitious persons and contain accounts of events which never took place. These do not concern us.

Some dark spots in the History of the Rāshṭrakūtas.

The subject of these lectures viz. some dark spots in the history of the Rāshṭrakūṭas is one that I had noted down for study some time ago when I perused the *praśasti* in the Rāmēśvara inscription of Kṛishṇa III at Proddaṭūru in the Anantapur District. On going through the Rāshṭrakūṭa accounts afresh in that connection, it appeared to me that the following questions required elucidation :— (1) Whether the family of the Rāshṭrakūṭas was indigenous to South India or not, (2) Who the earlier members of it were, where they held sway, and whether they had anything to do with the Western Chālukyas, politically or otherwise, before the time of Dantidurga, (3) Dantidurga's end and the puzzle about Kṛishṇa I's succession as well as the mystery surrounding Rāhappa, (4) What became of the W. Chālukyas after they were overthrown by Dantidurga and Kṛishṇa, and before they again rose into power, (5) The riddle about the lascivious Gōvinda II and his *dhārmic* brother Dhruva, (6) The policy followed by the Rāshṭrakūṭas towards the subjugated powers of the Eastern Chālukyas, Western Gaṅgas and Pallavas, (7) The state of the Rāshṭrakūṭa kingdom in the days of the boy emperor Amōghavarsha, his son, and his weak successors, (8) The occasion for the rise of Kṛishṇa III and what contributed to the success of his policy, (9) What the causes of the downfall of the Rāshṭrakūṭas were and the occasion for the rise of the W. Chālukyas of Kalyāṇi, and (10) the question regarding the claim of these W. Chālukyas to belong to the Bādāmi line. When the Director of Kannada Research asked me to take some subject connected with Kannada literature or history, I was glad that I had an opportunity of presenting my views under the aus-

pices of an institution engaged in research work. But in the writing of this sketch, owing to the want of a good library in my place, I had mainly to depend upon a few reference books that I could command and my own notes taken from time to time. Thanking you for giving me this opportunity to address you, I proceed with the subject.

One cannot commence to say anything on the Rāshṭrakūṭas without a meed of praise to the early writers on the history of that family. They have earned our gratitude for the honest contributions they have made. It will certainly take a long time to replace them as a source book of reference for correct information contained in the inscriptions treating of the families dealt with. Even from the limited information that was available at the time, these early writers did not fail to make an attempt to trace the origin of the family and to fish out its earlier members. The amount of labour they had brought to bear on the task of collecting the materials and handling them, the cogency of their reasoning and the care they had taken in judging impartially on the available evidences, are lessons to future workers In spite of all the care that had been bestowed and that could be bestowed, mistakes are liable to be found, which in the case of these writers, one is bound to say, are due, more or less to the dearth of needed information at the time on some particular points. They may require to be altered in the light of fresh materials. Want of care was not much their fault: rather one might complain of their having been overcareful in some respects. The palaeography of inscriptions had been subjected to very severe examination, and a small difference here or there, say of a letter or two, which may be due to more causes than one, or the irregular citation of some details of date, which feature is also to be noticed in numerous records that are palaeographically sound, have led to the condemnation, sometimes of all the parts of the documents, and they have been stamped 'spurious'. It being known that a particular king lived up to a certain year, the genuineness of the records of

a son or other relation, dated in years prior to the demise of the other, had been seriously questioned and suspected.

For such disposal of early inscriptions, one has only to look at the numerous Kannaḍa records of the Western Gaṅgas. The effect of this had sometimes been to delay the recognition of some of the historical facts. Even supposing the records are really spurious or forged, one has to see in what respects they are unworthy of credence. There is nothing to be gained by the forgerer in mis-stating historical events. It looks to us that the parts that would be really untrustworthy and that would require to be very carefully scrutinised in such records are the grant portions. At least to make the reader believe that the document which the forger was manufacturing in secret was genuine, he is sure to state facts of history correctly. Genuine records of Western Gaṅgas or Rāshṭrakūṭas discovered in later years show that they contain the same historical information as are found in what had been termed 'spurious records'. As such we cannot entirely ignore, neglect or consign to oblivion, the documents which are found to be defective in regard to the dates they cite or in other respects, such as palaeography etc. It behoves us, therefore, to separate from among documents, the really forged ones, those that are only defective in parts, such others that may appear to be copies made in later years with errors in dates and other particulars, and to adopt the historical information about which no reasonable doubt could be adduced.

In ancient days, when dilapidated temples had to be renovated, it was customary to take down copies of the inscriptions engraved on the walls or on stone slabs that were weather-beaten and to re-engrave them on the walls of the new temple. Sometimes only a gist of inscriptions was given, while in other cases the entire inscription had been reproduced. In all cases, the temple treasury had a file of the original of the grants whose copies were incised on temple walls and stone slabs. In the taking down of copies and re-engraving them, careless scribes have committed many mistakes and these are in ample evidence.

Persons who have had experience in examining manuscripts of old works in any language will not only bear out the above view, but will be able to speak about the idiosyncrasies of copyists which are sometimes very unintelligible. In the case of copies of inscriptions re-engraved, sometimes we are fortunate enough to get at the record stating that the whole set of inscriptions are copied over, and the time and occasion for copying and re-engraving. But more often this is not the case. That we have not chanced to get at the remark that particular inscriptions are copies, should not deter us from bestowing the same attention as we would if they are clearly stated to be such. Let it be remembered that even such inscriptions as are considered originals,— whether on stone, copper or other materials,— are truly copies of documents which must have been preserved elsewhere. The originals are irrecoverably lost, and we are to-day dealing only with copies, some of them are first copies, some are certified copies of the first, and others whose certification has not been traced. It is curious that a very huge number of inscriptions found in a particular part of the country should be spurious or forged; this must no doubt reflect on the people and stamp them as notorious forgers and false-document makers. What could be fittingly said with regard to these documents, the historical information contained in which agrees with that furnished in the genuine grants, is that they are copies made at some early period by scribes who could not correctly decipher the originals. What the circumstances were that gave rise to the making of copies, it cannot now be definitely divined.

The history of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line has suffered to some extent by the view taken of a few of the facts represented in *praśastis*, —which *praśastis*, we think, are clearly intended to extol the excellence of the members of the family and not to bring ill fame to them, —and secondly by consequent inferences based on these views. By the adoption of these views, the *praśastis* convey the very opposite of the subject intended by the writers. As a result, misrule, ill-feeling, internal dissensions and

frequent wars of succession have come to be attributed to the kings of this line, and some of the fine figures that played their noble parts in the stage of South Indian History for over two centuries from the middle of the eighth are made toappear in utter dark colours quite unfitting them. There is no doubt that the *pras'asti* writers have to share a portion of the blame in as much as they failed to foresee how their selection of, and adoption in, their own *praśastis* of verses from earlier writers on individual members of the family, would lead to the conceptions that had now been formed; but more rests on our understanding and interpretation of the records.

It is believed that 'the historical information preserved in the records which approximate more closely to a king's time of rule is more probably correct than that contained in others that are a little more removed'.[1] The presumption here is that *praśastis*, evidently purporting to be of later dates, are written for the first time by the writers from the accounts, traditionally handed down or remembered and not necessarily based on more reliable and contemporary accounts written from time to time and preserved in the family archives. If we could be assured of the truth or certainty regarding this presumption, there would be nothing to question the view. But the facts appear to point to the existence of records relating to the doings of each one of the kings, and they seem to have formed the prime source of the *praśasti* writers of later times to base their accounts of past kings. Besides, it could also be said that the *praśasti* writers got the information which they presented, from accounts found in earlier charters of the family that were available to them. The latter is rather unlikely. The fact that a few of the verses describing the historical events of some of the kings of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line occur in identical terms in the *praśastis* of different dates, affords conclusive proof to the effect that the writers did not compose them but incorporated them from extant accounts. In adopting these verses the framers of the *praśastis* should no doubt have

1 Dr. Fleet's Kanarese dynasties, p 391.

chosen such as had struck them to be of importance or such as had proved to be events of outstanding merit, and left out others which they did not think to be of much value. In thus cutting off the verses from regular narratives and piecing them together to form a brief outline of the past achievements of the family, and prefacing them, along with others of their own composition, to the grants made in their own time, the readers are sometimes handicapped to trace the thread of the story owing to the missing links which are indispensable for the easy understanding of the history of the dynasty. There could be no two opinions that the composers of the *pras'astis* would have deliberately eschewed such facts whose incorporation would have detracted the glory of the past members of the family. The eschewed passages have greatly distorted the real history of the family. We shall endeavour to show this in pursuing the events of the reigns of kings commencing with Dantidurga. With this preamble, I shall follow in this lecture the contents of the Proddaṭūru inscription whose text, is given in No. 68 of S. I. I. Vol. IX. Part, I. edited by Messers N. L. Rao and R. Shāmā Sastry: this inscription and a few others are particularly valuable for the light they shed on many a dark spot in the history of the Rāshṭrakūṭas.

The mythical genealogy of the family is the first. Verse 2 of the Proddaṭūru record reads:—

Asti Brahmā tat–Ōtrir–Atrēr–anu-nayanataś–ch–Ēndur–Indōr Budh—ōbhūj—jātas—Sòmānvayānām prathama-narapatis—tasya dīrgghāyur—asmāt.

Jātō—sau bhūmip-ēndrō Yadur—iti Kukurō Vṛishṇir—asy—āpi jātas—śrī—Vāsudēvas—tad-anu Ratipati—tat-sutas—ch—Āniruddhaḥ !!

"There was Brahmā; from him Atri; from his eyes the Moon (Indu): from him Budha: from him Āyus, who was the first of the kings of the lunar line: from him Yadu: from him Kukurō Vṛishṇi: from him Vāsudēva: then came Ratipati: his son was Aniruddha. Thus, in the family of the Yadus, there were many powerful kings." We may note here that other inscriptions

say that the Rāshṭrakūṭas belong to the Sātyaki-branch of the family of Yadu of the Lunar race. Though for purposes of Rāshṭra kūṭa history this account is not of much use, the pedigree of the mythical kings may be noted. They are available in the Purāṇas

Brahmā
|
Atri
|
Indu
|
Budha
|
Purūravas
|
Ayus
|
Nahusha
|
Yayāti *m* Dēvayānī
|
Yadu
|
Krōshṭu
⋮
Prithuśravas
⋮
Vrishṇi
⋮
Satvata
|
Andhaka

Kukura → Dēvaka → 7 daughters including Dēvakī *m* Vasudēva

Bhajamāna → Śura → Vasudēva

Vāsudēva
|
Ratipati
|
Aniruddha

Between Budha and Āyus, Purāṇas insert Purūravas; and between Āyuṣ and Yadu are given Nahusha and Yayāti. Vṛishṇi came in the line of Krōshṭu, the son of Yadu; and his lineal descendent was Satvata whose grandsons were Kukura and Bhajamāna. The ninth in descent from Kukura were the 7 daughters of Dēvaka who were married to Vasudēva, the 9th in descent from Bhajamāna. Their son was Vāsudēva.

The name Rāshṭrakūṭa is explained in the Proddaṭūru inscription thus:—

"Tasmin kulē sakala-vāridhi-chāru-vīchē Kāñchī-bhṛitau mahita-bhūmi-mahāmahishyaḥ Bhartt-ābhavan-nṛipa-sahasraka-mauli-mānyaṁ Śrī-Rāshṭrakūṭa iti nāma nijan-dadānaḥ (v 4)."

The Deōli[1] and the Karhad[2] plates seem to suggest that the family was originally called 'Tuṅga'; in that family there was Raṭṭa and the kings that came after him were said to be of the Rāshṭrakūṭa-vaṁśa so called after Raṭṭa's son. The Proddaṭūru inscription also employs '*tuṅgānvaya*' in describing Gōvinda III in verse 9 which is but partially preserved.

The origin of the family is wrapt in mystery. We have no means of knowing it with certainty. With regard to some of the families that held sway in southern India, we have indications that their early ancestors belonged to royal houses and came from different places and settled down in the South. The account about the Western Chālukyas for instance contained in the following statement viz. "When commencing with him, 59 emperors, whose succession was uninterrupted, and who sat on the throne of Ayōdhyā had passed away, a king of this race, Vijayāditya by name, went to the Dekhan (*Dakshiṇāpatha*), in order to conquer (it), and having overthrown Trilōchana-Pallava, through ill-luck went to another world", and then it speaks about the birth of Vishṇuvardhana etc. This shows that the ancestors of the Chālukyas were ruling over Ayōdhyā. The Gaṇgas appear to be

1 Ep. Ind..Vol V. p. 188 ff.

2 *Ibid.* Vol. IV. p. 286 ff.

foreigners to South India. They appear to have come from Magadha ; and may be the descendents of the last king of the Kaṇva dynasty, who was dispossessed of his kingdom by his Āndhrabhṛitya subordinate. The tradition about Chandragupta spending his last days in the Dekhan with Bhadrabāhu, his preceptor, leads us to believe that the territory, which was afterwards occupied and settled by the lineal descendents of the Kāṇvāyanas, was already known to the kings of the Magadha country, and they might even have had a small colony there. From time immemorial, the extreme south of the Indian peninsula was shared by the Chēra, Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya sovereigns : and the part of the country where the earliest members of the Kaṇvāyana, immigrants made a new home, seems to have belonged to the Chēras. This may be gathered from the fact that in some of the Western Chālukya grants the Gaṅgas are stated to be of the Chēra country. At least it is certain that there was a branch of the Gaṅga family, settled down in a part of the Chēra country. In this connection it is also worth noticing that the early members of the Western Gaṅgas viz. Mādhava I. Ayya (Hari or Ārya)-varman and Mādhava II, whose genuine grants have now come to light, show that they are connected with Paruvipura and that the later members claim Talakkāḍ as their capital. A branch of the Gaṅgas settled down in the Kaliṅga country with their capital at Kaliṅganagara and had an era of their own, which viewed from various points, takes us to circa A. D. 496. The starting of the era points to some unequalled success which the early members must have obtained over the kings of the surrounding land. The later Eastern Gaṅga grants, indeed, trace the origin of that family from the Western Gaṅgas just as the Eastern Chālukyas do from the Western Chālukyas. Similarly, the epigraphical evidence we have of the Pallavas shows that their earliest members were connected with the city of Kāñchī, while those that issued their grants from Palakkada and other places traced their relationship from the former. These indicate that at some remote period, several

families of rulers had to leave their homes in northern India and come away very far south, and mustering some strength, occupied a portion further north to contend successfully with their enemies, if possible. While the career of the Western Gaṅgas and Western Chālukyas that founded kingdoms in the South was cut short in a few centuries, the branch lines *i.e.* the Eastern Gaṅgas and the Eastern Chālukyas had a longer life. But as regards the lofty family *(Tuṅgānvaya)* of the Rāshṭrakūṭas the members of which claim to have showered gold, happiness, and wealth in plenty, always and out of season, on their subjects, the origin is wrapt in mystery.

As regards the name of the earliest member, let known to us by the *praśasti* writers viz. Raṭṭa, one may suspect if it is the name of a real person that ever was, or is only an eponym like Chōḷa, Pallava etc. But as recording the belief in those early days regarding the existence of a personality it is worth noting. Then there comes the question which is the original, Raṭṭa or Rāshṭrakūṭa. Before Amōghavarsha I, the term Raṭṭa is not found used. As such, is this a late appellation, and if so, what was the name by which the members of the family were called in the first instance? Of the terms Raṭṭa and Rāshṭrakūṭa, which is the original and which the derived one?

There is no doubt that in the early inscriptions, the term Rāshṭra is used to denote a district or subdivision, and the members composing the body representing the territorial division were called Rāshṭrakūṭa-pramukhas [in Tamil Nāṭṭār or Nāṭṭupperumakkaḷ], and these were in direct charge of the administration. Besides this representative body, there were also district or divisional officials appointed by the State who must have been styled Rāshṭrapatis or Rāshṭrkūṭas. These officials were honoured with fiefdoms not only of one division but were allowed to excercise absolute powers over more than one. In early ages paramount sovereigns entrusted the rule of provinces, districts and divisions,—*maṇḍala, janapada* or *rāshṭra,*—to feudal

lords and highly placed officers, for cognisible valuable services, rendered by them and the descendents of them, by their ability, intelligence and sagacity, found opportunities to rise much beyond their original status to the position of kings. When the Vijayanagara kingdom had grown to vast extent, the kings of the dynasty established capable men to rule over the provinces; and these were styled the Nāyakas. These provincial governors, by some inviolable terms not yet known to us, held their position hereditarily and acknowledged the overlordship of the sovereign power even when that power had been reduced to a state of insignificance. The position of the provincial chiefs remained unaffected and they were practically independent. Almost all great dynasties, in their palmy days, had followed the same principle. In some cases members belonging to the royal house were entrusted with the government of conquered territories. Thus the Pallavas, Chōḷas and Pāṇḍyas had created such provincial rulers. Though the origin of the later Kāḍavarāya chiefs is wrapt in obscurity, there is no doubt that their first ancestor was a member of the Pallava lineage. The Pottapi-Chōḷa family was a creation of the Chōḷa king Parāntaka I, after whom they styled themselves Madhurāntaka Pottapi-Chōḷas. Some of the Telugu-Chōḍa chiefs, who traced their descent from Karikāla, and the Chōḷa-Pāṇḍya and viceroys of the Pāṇḍya Kēraḷa countries, who were also related to the members of the imperial family of the Chōḷas of Tanjore, are other instances. In fact among the duties enjoined on kings of yore,—such as the protection of the *dharma* of his subjects, the administration of the country in accordance with the establishd laws, the enforcing of the laws of the *kula, grāma, jāti, janapada, nagara* or *śrēṇi*, the proper using of the four-fold means of subjection, the granting of *parihāras* laying down *vyavasthas*, the earning of merit by the construction of works of public utility, making and granting of new villages, building of temples, feeding-houses and resting places, the digging of tanks, non-interference with the daily management of religious and

charitable endowments etc.,—the establishment of royal families or ruling chiefs is one. It was in accordance with this ancient rule of practice that several new families had come in and their origin remains to be traced. In some cases, tradition, as recorded in inscriptions, has preserved the origin of the family as noted already. When feudal lords assumed independence, there seems some likelihood of their preserving the origin in the titles which they bore. The titles Daḷavāy and Nāyak indicate that they were commanders of armies under their suzerain lords. Whether a similar origin could be traced for the Rāshṭrakūṭas requires to be investigated.

Some early members of the Rāshṭrakūṭas.

The Merkara plates of the Western Gaṅga king Avinīta mention a certain Akālavarsha-Śubhatuṅga as having flourished in the 5th century A D. Dr. Hultzsch has expressed the view that this Akālavarsha-Śubhutuṅga may be the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Krishṇa, father of Indra defeated by the Western Chalukya Jayasimha I. There is so much in the name and title of Akālavarsha-Śubhatuṅga that it is impossible to take him for a person of any other family. The Merkara plates and many others have indeed been pronounced as spurious by Fleet. Hultzsch did not consider his judgement a bar to the identification that he had made. The reference is important as proving the existence of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family at or before the time when the Western Chalukyas settled themselves in South India. At least Hultzsch did not think there was any impossibility of a Rāshṭrakūṭa figuring in such an early period and did not also question the correctness of Jayasimha's victory over the Rāshṭrakūṭa Krishṇa. But Fleet took a different view. Speaking of certain coins he said, " though the tendency has been to refer these coins to an early Rāshṭrakūṭa king, who was supposed to have been conquered (in parenthesis you will note that it is no supposition but a plain statement made in a grant) somewhere about A.D. 500, by the Western Chalukya Jayasimha I, still

there is nothing that compels us to connect them with the Rāshṭrakūṭa or any particular dynasty, and nothing to lead us to believe that any victory over the Rāshṭrakūṭas or, indeed, any historical achievement at all, was accomplished by Jayasimha. The supposed existence of an early Rāshṭrakūṭa king Krishṇa-rāja, contemporaneous with Jayasimha I, depends on nothing but a statement which first appears in the 11th century A.D. and is to be accounted for by events which occurred about A.D. 975". He adds "according to the Kauṭhem grant of A.D. 1009, there was an early Rāshṭakūṭa king Indra, son of Kṛishṇa, who was conquered by Jayasimha I of the family of the Western Chalukyas of Bādāmi, about the beginning of the 6th century A. D. The statement in question appears first in the 11th century A. D. after the overthrow of the Rāshṭrakūṭas by the Western Chalukyas of Kalyāṇi." Because Dr. Fleet has thought that "there is ncthing whatever to support it in the early records, it is to be accounted for simply by the facts that after the overthrow of Karka II by Taila II, there survived Indra IV, grandson of Kṛishṇa III by crowning whom the Gaṅga prince Mārasimha attempted to continue the Rāshṭrakūṭa sovereignty". It is open to you to adopt this ingenious way of brushing away a fact and to lightly say that the Indians believed that history repeated itself and charter writers attributed to earlier kings of the family that they dealt with the achievements of later members'. While the above was the view of Fleet on the Merkara plates in which Akālavarsha Śubhatuṅga occurs and of the express statement that Jayasimha defeated Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa, son of Indra, he has held that Attivarman of the Guntur district grant may possibly be a Rāshṭrakūṭa. He notes "Attivarman is described as born in the family of king Kandara, which was descended from the lineage of a great sage Ānanda and was purified by worshipping the God Śambhu at Vaṅkēśwara." The grant has been treated as Pallava. "It is difficult to adopt these details to their accounts, though Attivarman does, like the Pallavas, claim to belong to posterity of *hiranyagarbha* i. e. Brahmā. On the

other hand, the name Kandhara,–and doubtless Kandhara also,—is a variant of Kṛishṇa ; and this suggests that he may possibly have been an early Rāshṭrakūṭa ".

Discoveries since made had not been favourable to the surmise of Fleet. In the preface to Volume VI of the South-Indian Inscription, I drew attention to a lithic record at Chezerala in the Guntur district which refers itself to the rule of the early Pallava king Mahēndravarmma-mahārāja of the Bhāradvāja-gōtra, called also by the titles Avanibhājana, and Vēgavatīsanātha. On the other face of the slab there is another inscription written in the same script : this and the one of Mahēndravarman seem to be materially connected. Though this inscription is much damaged, it has been possible to make out that the grandson of the chief Kandaṛāja through his daughter made rich donations to the local temple. Kandaṛāja, the inscription tells us, belonged to the lineage of Ānandamaharishi and was the lord of Kandarapura-janapada. He is styled *Trikūṭaparvatapati.* It appears that he had the banner of a monkey (*gōlāṅgūla-vijayakētana*). The further information that we could gather from the epithet *sitētara Beṇṇānātha* given to him in the inscription is that the region where he held sway lay in the country watered by the Kṛishṇā river. These details are enough to exclude him from being a member of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line, though there could be no doubt that the term *janapadādhipati* applied to him is an equivalent of ' a Rāshṭrakūṭa king '.

On the other hand his daughter is stated to be a great queen and her husband, who must have been of a different house, was a ruling chief or of royl descent. The chiefly interesting account about her son is that he is called Pṛithvīyuvarāja, that he had the banner of the eagle (*gṛidhrādhyāsita-ketanaḥ*) and his seal had the *garuḍa* mark (*sa-garuḍa-muraripu-sanātha-śāsanaḥ*). He was the lord of *Samṛiddhapalli-janapada.* This *janapadādhi-pati* may well be a member of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line to judge from the seal and banner.

What is specially worthy of note about this *janapadādhipati*—a term which means a Rāshṭrakūṭa—is that his inscription is engraved on the one face of the same slab on which a record of the Pallava king Mahēndravarman I is incised, and almost in the same hand. Like the Rāshṭrakūṭas, the chief had the *lānchhana* and flag. That there were other *janapadāhipatis*, who had different flags and seals, is clear from this very inscription which speaks of Kandararāja, the grandfather by the mother's side of the above mentioned chief, as the lord of Kandarapuravara-janapada and styled Trikūṭa-parvatapati having a monkey banner; he was the lord of the region watered by the Kṛishṇā river. Since Kubja Vishṇuvardhana, the younger brother of Pulakēśin II was entrusted with the rule of. the Vēṅgī country in circa A. D. 615, the Chezerala inscription of Mahēndravarman I must be placed before that date. We may not be far wrong if we assign it to the year immediately preceding the commencement of the tour of conquest of Pulakēśin II (A. D. 609–612) in which he successfully defeated the kings of Kanauj, Kōsala and Kaliṅga, reduced the fortress of Pishṭapura, and forced the Pallava king to take refuge within the ramparts of Kāñchī. It seems unlikely that Mahēndravarman I had any hold on the region of the Kṛishṇā after A. D. 615. It is interesting to note that Pṛithvīyuvarāja figures as an *ājñapti* in the Kopparam grant of Pulakēśin II dated in the 21st year of reign (A. D. 630). His deeds of valour are described therein. He is said to have defeated the circle of enemies by his arm, which was the churning stick of the wicked people of the *Kali* age and which had performed daring deeds in many battles wielding the drawn sword: he is said to have secured the kingdom to the lineage of Pulakēśin's son. Unless we are assured that there were two Pṛithvīyuvarājas flourishing in the same time as indicated by the Kopparam grant of PulakeśinII and the Chezerala inscription of the time of the Pallava Mahēndravarman I, we find no serious difficulty in identifying the two. The identification has much to tell us. There is no question that the Pallavas lost their hold

on the region, and their place was taken up by the Western Chalukyas, and their feudal subordinates. If Pṛithvīyuvarāja of *garuḍa-lāñchhana* and *gṛidhradhvaja* was a Rāshṭrakūṭa, the political relationship of his to the Western Chalukya house at the time, is clearly seen by his fighting with the enemies of his overlord resulting in securing the kingdom to the son of Pulakēśin II. Though Pulakēśin II carried everything before him in the first quarter of the seventh century A. D., his reverses were not far off. Mahēndravarman's successor proved finally more than a match for him. The Kopparam plate indicates unmistakably that Pulakēśin and his sons were involved in trouble before A. D. 630 and a feudal subordinate had to come for rescue. The downfall of Pulakēśin II and the sacking of Bādāmi has been placed by Dr. Fleet just before A. D. 643. The fact that the inscription of Narasimhavarman I on the Jayasthamba set up by him after sacking the city is dated in the 13th year of the Pallava king's reign, makes it clear that he succeeded Mahēndravarman in A. D. 629-30 at the latest. This year, it may be noted, corresponds to the date of the Kopparam grant i. e. Pulakēśin's 21st year of reign. The Pallava hold on the city must have lasted for more than a decade from A. D. 643 to A. D. 655, which period is a blank in the history of the Western Chalukyas. That Vikramāditya I and his brothers were grown up in A. D. 630 is evident by the same plates as well as from the account furnished in the Western Chalukya records of Vikramāditya's successors While Vikramāditya concentrated his attention to making the unbending Pallava to bow before him and subduing the southern powers[1] i. e. Pāṇḍya, Chōḷa, Kérala and Kaḷabhras, he seems to have entrusted the command of the army fighting in the north to his son and grandson. It is said that Vinayāditya at the command of his father engaged himself in a war with the northern kings and obtained the *Pālidhvaja* banner

1. pitur ājñayā .... sakala uttarāpatha - nātha - mathanōpārjjita-pālidhvajādisamasta-paramaiśvaryya-chihnasya ... mahārājādhirājaparamēśvara Vinayādityasya.

which was the symbol of paramountcy and had it for the family; and that Vijayāditya advanced forth with the vanguard of his grandfather's forces and appropriated *Gaṅgā-yamunā-pālidhvaja-paṭāhaḍhakka-mahāśabda-chhihna*.[1] From the above, we see that the *Pālidhvaja* had become the permanent banner of he Western Chāḷukyas since the time of Vikramāditya. Any defeat inflicted on the Western Chāḷukyas will be signalised by the capture of the *Pālidhvaja* banner. This is necessary to be borne in mind in what we are going to say about the Rāshṭrakūṭas whose banner was *garuḍa* or *gṛidhra*.

Another fact to be remembered is that the Chāḷukyas termed themselves Vallabha: and this term was also used by others to denote them. The Kopparam plates of Pulakēśin II call him Vallabha.[2] Pallava and Pāṇḍya inscriptions refer to the Western Chāḷukyas as Vallabha. So well known was the title Vallabha of the Chāḷukyas that the writer of the Udayēndiram plates of Nandivarman referred to the kings of this line by this title alone without even mentioning their names:—[3]

Text 1. 14 f. Tasmāt Agastya iva vimathita Vātāpiḥ Pariyaḷa - Maṇimaṅgala - Śūramāra - prabhṛitishu jētā bahuśō *Vallabharājasya* Narasimhavarmmā. Ibid 1.16 f. Peruvaḷanallūra-yuddhē vijita-Vallabhaḥ Paramēśvaravarmmā. These two Pallava kings and their conquest of the Vallabhas are described in the Vēlūrpāḷayam plates thus:—

V. 11 Tad-ātmajād āvirabhūn - Mahēndrād - upēndrakīrttirn-Narasiṁhavarmmā Vātāpi-madhyē vijit-āri-varggaḥ-sthitañ-jaya-stambham-alambhayad yaḥ.

---

1. dakshiṇāpatha-vijayini pitāmahē ... ...gurōr-agratah ēva āhava-vyāpāramācharan ......Gaṅgā-Yamunā-pālidhvaja-patāha-dhakkā-mahāśabda-chihna ... ... pitrisād-kurvan ...... sakala-pāramaiśvaryya-vyakti pālidhvājādy-ujjvala prājya rājyōVijayāditya ... mahārājādhirāja-paramēśvara

2. Be it known to you that Vallabha being present in person, the execution (of the grant) was formally etc.,".

3. S. I. I. Vol. III. p. 366.

V. 12 Tataḥ paramada-dhvamsī babhūva Paramēśvaraḥ Chāḷukya-kshitibhṛitsainya-dhvānta-dhvaṁsa-divākaraḥ.

In later times, the epithet became more commonly adopted by other rules as well. Rāshṭrakūṭas sometimes affixed to their names and titles 'Vallabha' as Śubhatuṅgavallabha, Amōghavarshavallabha etc. This indiscriminate later application of the term causes no small confusion, and one has to be very cautious to find out who is really meant by the term whenever it occurs.

But it is not the case with the '*Pālidhvaja*'. It refers to the particular kind of banner which the Western Chāḷukyas obtained in the first instance from some northern powers and appropriated to themselves. Therefore, it would appear that the Western Chāḷukyas had no banner of their own before the time when they adopted this banner. Even if they had, the express statement that they appropriated it to themselves shows their willing preference. But it may be said that this is not usual, and one would not easily prefer to use another's banner or other *insignia* of royalty. I think we may be perfectly sure that when a king is said to have had the Pāḷidhvaja banner, he was a Chāḷukya and that when the banner of a king is said to have been captured by another it means that the former sustained a defeat. The statement cannot be taken literally, as it is sometimes done. From the foregoing, it will be seen that Pṛithvīyuvarāja has a better claim to be regarded as an early member of the Rāshṭrakūṭas by his banner and *lāñchhana* than the two others who were suspected to be of that line. That he was a feudatory of the Western Chāḷukyas of Bādāmī and rendered them valuable service in times of need is worthy of note.

The Rāshṭrakūṭa family comes into prominence in the days of Dantidurga at the end of the first half of the 8th century A. D. We have to see the circumstances that favoured the rise of the family in South India and the state

of the Dekhan at the time. Two of the greatest powers of South India were the Pallavas and the western Chāḷukyas. The Pallavas were holding suzerain power all along the Eastern part of the Madras presidency (right up to Trichinopoly) for a number of centuries from the time of Śiva skandavarman. Their expansion obliterated for a period one of the most powerful kingdoms of Southern India *i.e.* the Chōḷas. The Bāṇas were their feudatory allies and their territory lay next to the West and North stretching up to Śrīsailam. Of Mayūraśarman the first Kadamba king (cir. 5th century A. D.) it is said that he levied tribute from the Bāṇas. The Bāṇa country (Perumbāṇappāḍi) lay to the West of Vaḍugavaḷi. Further West were the dominions of the Western Gaṅgas [1]. By some terms of treaty, the Pallavas seem to have had a hand in the anointment of the Western Gaṅga kings. Ayyavarman or Harivarman and Siṁhavarman *alias* Mādhavavarman were crowned by the Pallava sovereigns Siṁhavarman and Skandavarman [2]. Fleet gives to Ayyavarman's son Mādha mahādhirāja Siṁhavarman, installed by Skandavarman of the Pallavas, A.D. 470. This date is none too high for him. The interest taken by the Pallavas, at this time *i. e.* before the rise of the Western Chāḷukyas of Bādāmi, in the coronation of the Western Gaṅgas is noteworthy as indicating somewhat a close political relationship between the two houses. When the same right was exercised even in the days of Nandivarman III, one could see clearly that this cordiality continued. At the time when the Western Chāḷukyas appeared on the scene and carved out a kingdom for themselves by defeating the Kadambas and Western Gaṅgas, the Pallavas had to contend with them from their inception to the end. A genuine charter of Vikramāditya II, the Western Chāḷukya king, makes a clear admission of the sufferings inflicted on that king's predecessors by the Pallavas, and tells us of his own attitude

1. Of Koṅguṇivarman, the progenitor of the Western Gaṅgas, it is recorded that he was anointed to conquer the Bāṇa-maṇḍala.
2. Ep. Ind. Vol. XIV p. 332.

towards them.[1] It is recorded here " He (Vikramāditya II) resolved to uproot completely his natural enemy, the Pallavas who had robbed of their splendour the previous kings born of his race ".

With Kīrtivarman II, the son and successor of Virkramāditya II, whose reign extended up to A. D. 775, the career of the main line of Western Chāḷukyas of Bādāmi came to an end (Chāḷukya-rājya-śrīr antarayiny abhavat bhuvi[2]). The winding-up of this line did not benefit the Pallavas, who were all along contending with them, exhausting themselves and their opponents. The final defeat of the Western Chāḷukya Kīrtivarman was inflicted by the Rāshṭrakūṭas and they came to occupy their place. By the way, we have to take particular note of the fact that the main line of the pallavas came to close in about the beginning of the 8th century A. D. The state of affairs in the Pallava country which was left without a legitimate claimant in the main line, necessitating the ministers and others to go about borrowing one from a collateral branch, must have given a very favourable opportunity for the Rāshṭrakūṭa predecessors of Dantidurga to rise into sudden importance resulting finally in the overthrow of the Western Chāḷukyas. The Rāshṭrakūṭas had to contend hard with the newly set up king Nandivarman Pallavamalla supported as he was by an able general, and the final act of Dantidurga was really a very daring one. The territory over which the Western Chāḷūkyas ruled, and to which their political successors, the Rāshṭrakūṭas became practical heirs, is defined in copper-plates as ' *Sētu-Narmadā-madhyam sārdha-sapta-laksham* ' and it is said that it was obtained by the Western Chāḷukyas in the first instance by conquering the Kadambas and the Western Gaṅgas (*Kadamba Gaṅgān nirjjitya*[3]). The Western Chāḷukyas called the Western Gaṅgas as their hereditary servants[4].

---

1. S. I. I. Vol. I p. 146.
2. Ind. Ant. Vol. VIII. p. 11 f.
3. S. I. I. Vol. I. p 54.
4. Ind. Ant. Vol. VII. p. 303.

We know that the territory of the Rāshṭrakūṭas in South India was called Raṭṭapāḍi and that it consisted of seven and a half lakshas. Being obtained by conquering the Western Chāḷukyas, it could be no other than the territory which they originally secured from the Kadambas and Western Gaṅgas and which bore the same index *sārddha-saptalaksham* as noted already. In this connection we may note that in India the original country or kingdom generally, always remained as such, and fresh conquests gave the conqueror only increased power and wealth as well as overlordship of the conquered territories which be it remembered, were left to be ruled by one of the members of the vanquished rulers. It is only in extreme cases, annexation of territories took place: even then the added territories very often retained their original extents and sometimes their names also. The *Dharma* of the country had been,—and it was followed or acted up to through ages,—that when a country had of necessity to be subdued by invasion which is the last of the four means that a king had to adopt, and the life of the enemy had to be sacrificed in battle, a *vaṁśya* of the hostile king was invariably set up in the subjugated country. Vāli and Rāvaṇa might be despatched but in their places Sugrīva and Vibhīshaṇa had to be installed. Though annexation of conquered territories might be the best expedient to prevent recurrence of wars and the consequent loss of lives, and remove the evil once for all it was seldom adopted in india, being not sanctioned by the Hindu Law. The Chōḷa conquest of the Vēṅgi country by Rājarāja I resulted in the installing of Dānārṇṇava. The Pāṇḍya King Māṛavarman Sundara-Paṇḍya I, when he reduced the Chōḷa dominions, volunteered to give back the kingdom and did so on the king submitting to the conqueror. The Chōḷa conquest of the Pāṇḍya and the Kēraḷa countries by Rājēndra Chōḷa I and his predecessors, finally resulted in the appointment of a Chōḷa viceroy in the two countries, in addition to the ruling kings of the place. The same procedure may also be found adopted by the Rāshṭrakūṭas, as will be seen in the sequel.

The position occupied by the Rāshṭrakūṭas in South India, as sketched above, at once determined who their enemies were or would be. Foremost among the enemies would be the Western Chāḷukyas themselves, who, whenever they found fit opportunities, would try to avail of them to throw off their allegience to the conqueror and to regain their original position. By stepping into the place of the Western Chāḷukyas, the Rāshṭrakūṭas became the hereditary enemies of the Pallavas with their feudatories the Western Gaṅgas, as were the Western Chāḷukyas before them. They would necessarily have to contend with the Bāṇas. It is also patent that no good feeling might be expected to last between the newly planted Rāshṭrakūṭas and the Chāḷukyas of Vēngi in whose veins the blood of the Western Chāḷukyas ran. The history of the Rāshṭrakūṭas must tell us how they grappled with the situation in South India, leave alone the part which they must have had to play with the powers that surrounded them in the country subjected to their original sway.

The Proddaṭūru inscription speaking of Dantidurga says[1] :— " In this family there was the glorious Dantidurga who was the sole ruler of the earth, whose strength of arm was irresistible, and who long enjoyed as his sole mistress the Rāja-lakshmi that was obtained by churning the ocean of (the family of) the Chāḷukyas. On the entreaties of the damsels of the worlds of gods, the king Sāhasatuṅga went, while (yet) he was a youth, to heaven, just as a sun passes to the other world. "

The Proddaṭūru inscription tells us that Dantidurga enjoyed Lakshmi (*i. e.* the country) that was obtained by churning the ocean (*i. e.* by putting to route the armies of the Chāḷukyas). The achievement of Dantidurga is not new to history : it is

---

1. " *Tatrānvayēyabhavad ēkapatiḥ pṛithivyāṁ S'rī-Dantidurga iti durddhara bāhu-vīryaḥ* | *Chāḷukya-sindhu-mathanōdbhava lakshmīṁ yas sambabhāra chiram ātma-kul-aṅka-kāntāṁ* || *Tasmin Sāhasatuṅga nṛipata Svas-sundarī prārthitē yātē yuni Divaṁ divākara-samaṁ* "

even more vividly described elsewhere as we shall see presently. But that Dantidurga was also known as Sāhasatuṅga and that he passed away while yet he was young, are not given in other records of the Rāshṭrakuṭas. Dantidurga's daring deeds of valour which must have earned the title or surname Sāhasatuṅga are described in more than one record[1] :—

Kāñchīśa–Kēraḷā -narādhipa–Chōḷa–Pāṇḍya–Śrīharsha–Vajraṭa–vibhēda–vidhāna–daksham Karṇāṭakam balam anantam ajēyam-anyair bhṛityaiḥ kiyadbhirapi yas sahasā jigāya॥Abhrū,vibhaṅgam-agṛihīta niśāta–śāstram ajñātam apraṇihitājñam apētayatnam Yō Vallabham sapadi daṇḍa-balēna jitvā Rājādhirāja–Paramēśvara–tāmavāpa ॥

The conquest of Vallabha, by which is meant the Chāḷukya king Kīrtivarman II, and the Karṇāṭa army which had in previous years defeated Śrīharsha, Vajraṭa and others, as found stated in Dantidurga's own record of Samangad[2] dated in A. D. 754, is noticed in the Talegaon plates [3] of Kṛishṇa I dated in A. D. 768, the Alas plates [4] of the *yuvarāja* Gōvinda II dated in A. D. 770 and elsewhere also; and no difficulty was felt in identifying the Vallabha mentioned therein with the Western Chāḷukya Kīrtivarman II. It was by defeating this powerful Western Chāḷukya ruler that Dantidurga obtained the title of Rājādhirāja-Paramēśvara, the supreme lord of kings, an epithet which necessarily implies that the conquered was a powerful king of some other dynasty. We think that a king of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line will not be entitled to this high title of Rājādhirāja-Paramēśvara by simply overcoming or subduing a prince of his own line who proved himself turbulent.

Dantidurga's earliest known inscription is that engraved on the Ellora plates, [5] dated in Śaka 663 (A.D. 742) and pronounc-

1. See for instance Ep. Ind. Vol. XIII. v. 6 [illegible] and Vol. XXII p. 182 v.8
2. Ind. Ant. Vol. XI. p. 11.
3. Ep. Ind. Vol. XIII. p 275.
4. *Ibid.* Vol. II p 209.
5. *Ibid.* Vol. XXV. p. 25 f.

ed genuine by the editor. That Dantidurga did not reign long but passed away while he was yet young (*Svas-sundarī-prārthitē yūni divaṁ gatē*) as the Proddaṭūru inscription puts it, is to some extent borne out by the fact that so far as known, he had only a reign of 16 years from A.D. 742 of the Ellora plates to A.D. 758 the earliest known date of Kṛishṇa I,[1] and there is likelihood of Kṛishṇa I having conquered and obtained possession of Vallabha's territory immediately after his accession coinciding with the date of the demise of Kīrtivarman in A.D. 758. That Dantidurga left no sons and that Kṛishṅa I, his paternal uncle, succeeded him are recorded in many Rāshṭrakūṭa records.

We shall now take up the question as to what became of the country conquered by Dantidurga, after his demise. There is no doubt that eventually Kṛishṇarāja I brought it under his rule, relieving the subjects from the oppression which they were said to have been under-going under a certain Vallabha. One of the facts that mars the fine history of the Rāṣhṭrakūṭa family, as we have it presented, is that at the commencement of the reigns of almost all the kings of this line, there had heen a dispute about succession, a feature that is seldom met with in any other annals of Indian kingdoms and that is hardly possible to be found in a family of kings who had good schooling in *Dharma* before assuming the royal purple, who were surrounded by fearless and learned councillors with good family traditions and high character, who had for their guidance the *Smritis* propounded by wise sages and the *Itihāsas* that put the principles in practical examples. We are in the threshold of the first of these astounding phenomena and it behoves us to investigate the matter thoroughly. One of the early authorities on the Rāshṭrakūṭā history[2] was for discrediting the statement of the Kadaba plates that Dantidurga died childless, on the score that it is found in a record 200 years after the occurrence. He was of opinion that

1. B. I. S, M. J. Vol. VIII. pp 165 f.
2. Bom. Gaz. p 194-5.

the prince dethroned or destroyed by Kṛishṇa I could not have been Dantidurga, as had been supposed by some writers, since he was a powerful monarch who for the first time acquired supreme sovereignty for his family.

We have noted about Dantidurga (i) that he died childless, (ii) that after him, Karkarāja's son Kṛishṇarāja I ascended the throne ridding the country of the sufferings which it was undergoing under a certain Vallabha, (iii) that Dantidurga went to heaven while he was yet a youth and (iv) that his reign, so far as we know it, extends only to 16 years. It will be seen that the last facts only go to confirm what is reported in the Kadaba plates. Add to these, we may say that no mention of a son of Dantidurga is made either in his own records or in others.

Now, the Proddaṭūru inscription tells us pointedly that on the death of Dantidurga, the country was reduced to the position of a *vēśyā,* before it came under the permanent enjoyment of Kṛishṇarāja. The verse under reference is :—

Tasmin Sāhasatuṅga-nāmni nṛipatau Svas-sundarī-prārthitē
yātē yūni divaṁ divākarasamaṁ vēśya ēva Lakshmī tataḥ ।
Tatrāvāpa bhuja-dvayēna nibiḍaṁ sāślishya ramyair guṇaiḥ prītyā
prāṇasamaṁ chiraṁ ramayati Śrī-Kṛishṇarājādhipam ॥

Vēśyēva applied to Lakshmī (*i. e.* the kingdom) leads one to infer that the kingdom was subject to the possession of at least one else before it passed into the hands of Kṛishṇarāja. It is a question whether the one into whose possession it fell at first was a member of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line or not. More probably he was not of the line. Next the use of the word *chiraṁ* with regard to her union with Kṛishṇa I is suggestive of the fact that it was only for a short time that it was under another and that it did not take long for Kṛishṇa to obtain it. Lastly, the verse also indicates that Dantidurga left no sons to succeed him. In this connection it is necessary to refer to verses which speak of Dantidurga and Kṛishṇa I. Just as it is said of Dantidurga that he obtained the paramount dignity of Rājādhirāja-Paramēśvara after conquering

Vallabha,[1] Kṛishṇarāja is said to have obtained the same dignity by conquering a certain Rāhappa.[2] The question is whether the kings overcome viz. Vallabha and Rāhappa must be rulers of different countries or whether they were members of the Rāsṭra-kūṭa line. We have noted that the very title Rājādhirāja-Paramēśvara which the conqueror obtained suggests that the kings vanquished must be rulers of different countries. In the accout about Dantidurga and Kṛishṇarāja, we find that the conquest of Vallabha which gave the dignity of Rājādhirāja-Paramēśvara to Dantidurga is immediately followed by a verse which states "that when the Vallabha had passed away Karkkarāja's son Kṛishṇarāja became king." Vallabha here is usually taken to refer to Dantidurga and not to the immediately preceding Vallabha whom Dantigurga vanquished and who had correctly been identified with the Western Chāḷukya king Kīrtivarman II. This, we think, is done for the natural reason that the succession must speak of the predecessor's passing away. Cannot there be a reference in the verse quoted, to a Western Chāḷukya king? Barring this reference there is no other which calls Dantidurga by the term Vallabha.

The verse under reference is read as follows in the Talegaon plates :—

Tasmin divaṁ prayātē Vallabharājē-kṛita-prajā-vādha [ḥ] ।
Śrī-Kakkarāja-sūnurmmahīpati [ḥ] Kṛishṇarāj-ōbhūt ॥

and this has been rendered "After he, the Vallabharāja, had gone to heaven, Kṛishṇarāja I, the son of Kakkarāja, who did not oppress his subjects, became the lord of the Earth." A reference to line 12 on the plate will show that there is some space between *va* and *dha* which will just suffice for the *ē* sign of *dhē*. The reading intended is certainly *kṛita-praja-vā* (*bā*) *dhē* and not *vāda* [*ḥ*]. In this connection we may also note that there is absolutely no space after *dha*. The *kṛi* of *kṛita* exactly resembles *kṛi* of *Krishṇa* occurring at the end of the same line 12,

1 Ep. Ind. Vol. XIII. p. 279, v. 6 and Vol XXII, p. 182 v. 8
2 *Ibid.* Vol, XXII. p. 183

The reading *krita-prajā-bādhē* occurs in other plates as well. This word in the locative case is an adjunct of Vallabharāja. Who is this Vallabharāja ? In the last half of the previous verse Vallabha has been introduced as the enemy conquered by Dantidurga, and there, there is no doubt that it refers to the Western Chāḷukya ruler (Kīrtivarman II). The words *tasmin divaṁ prayātē Vallabharājē* following immediately the Vallabha of the previous line may in all likelihood refer to the same person. Besides, Dantidurga is not given the surname Vallabharāja which is generally assumed by the Western Chāḷukya kings. And for aught we know, as explained already, Kṛishṇa's accession did not follow the demise of Dantidurga. That the kingdom had been in the enjoyment of another after Dantidurga and before Kṛishṇa, has also been noted. In editing the Talegaon plates Dr. Sten Konow has remarked:—

Dr. Fleet has mentioned that Dantidurga's epithet Vallabharāja, (which occurs in line 12 of the Talegaon plates), is of interest " because through its Prākṛit forms, it explains the name Balharas " by which the contemporaneous Arab travellers and geographers of the ninth and tenth centuries A. D. used to speak of these kings ". Dantidurga's successor was his paternal uncle Krishṇarāja I, and the present grant was issued by him. According to the Baroda plates of the Rāshṭrkūṭa king Kakkarāja Suvarṇavarsha of Gujerat, Kṛishṇa ascended the throne after uprooting a relative of his[1] ; Compare

Yō vaṁs'yaṁ unmūlya vimārggabhājaṁ rājyaṁ svayaṁ gōtra-hitāya chakrē

Dr. Fleet was inclined to infer from this statement that Kṛishṇarāja forcibly replaced his nephew Dantidurga. The wording of verse 9 of Kṛishṇarāja's own grant, howerer, would lead us to believe that the relative whom he had to fight was somebody else, who claimed the throne after Dantidurga's death.

1. Ind. Ant. Vol. XII p. 162 and Bom. Gaz. p. 391.

(v. 9) After he, the Vallabharāja, had gone to heaven, Kṛishṇarāja I, the son of Kakkarāja, who did not oppress his subjects, became the lord of the earth."

This rendering is obtained by adopting the reading *akrita-prajā-bādaḥ* of what ought to be *kṛita-prajā-bādhē* referring to Vallabharāja and not of Kṛishṇarāja.

But from the Proddaṭūru inscription and the Baroda plates, it is certain that the kingdom which Kṛishṇarāja brought under his direct rule for the good of the family was in charge of another. This person is referred to by the term *vaṁśya* in the Baroda plates with the epithet *vimārggabhāja.* and *Vallabharāja* with the epithet *kṛitaprajā-bādhē* in the Talegaon plates, showing clearly the necessity for Kṛishṇarāja's interference and for bringing the country under his rule. From the fresh light obtained from the Proddaṭūru inscription, it becomes obvious that the royal person indicated by the terms *vaṁśya* or *Vallabha* is not to be identified with Dantidurga. And we have stated already that by Vallabha must be meant a Western Chāḷukya king. We may add here that he need not necessarily be Kīrtivarman himself though that is not improbable. Again, the date of the Antroli-chharoli record[1] (A. D. 757) falling between the latest known year of Dantidurga and the date of the earliest. record of Kṛishṇā I in Bhārat Itihāsa Maṇḍal viz. 758 A.D. coupled with the ordinary connotation of the word *vaṁs'ya* would naturally suggest that Kakka II might be the person intended. But we see nothing to fit him to the description (*vimārga-bhajā*) given about Kṛishṇa's opponent (and there is no surety that there are no earlier dates for him than A.D. 757). *Vaṁs'ya* does mean 'a kinsman' but not one connected with Dantidurga or Kṛishṇarāja, being referred to by the epithet Vallabharāja. When a country is conquered, as in the case under reference the law of the land enjoins that the conqueror should instal on the throne of the vanquished country a member belonging to the royal

1. J. Bo B. A. S. Vol. XVI. p 106

family of the latter, dicating the terms to be abided by him, besides granting *parihāras* for the damages done during the war to the religious and administrative institutions in the conquered country. Vishṇu-sūtra has the following on the subject :—

" Having conquered the country, let him (the conqueror) not abolish the *dharma* of that country (III, 42). A king having conquered the capital of the foe, should invest there a prince of the royal race of that country with the royal dignity (III, 47). Let him not exterpate the royal race (48) unless the royal race be of ignoble descent (49). " On the same, Manu lays down :—

Jitvā sampūjayēt dēvā brāhmaṇāṁśchaiva dhārmikān ।
Pradadyāt parihārāṁścha khyāpayēd abhayāni cha ॥
Sarvēshāṁ tu viditvaishāṁ samāsēna chikīrshitaṁ ।
Sthāpayēttatra tad-*vaṁs'yaṁ* kuryāchcha samayakṛiyāṁ ॥
Pramāṇāni cha kurvīta tēshāṁ dharmyānyathōditān ।

According to both the authorities, the one installed on the throne — a member of the vanquished royal family — is called *vaṁs'ya* ; and it is this *vaṁs'ya* established by Dantidurga that had to be uprooted by Krishṇarāja owing to his misbehaviour, meaning perhaps the non-observance of the terms of the treaty (samaya-kṛiya) or disturbing the peace ot the people. Thus, not only is *vaṁs'ya* of one record reconciled to the term *Vallabha* of the other records but it also shows that he must have been a member, distant though it be, of the Western Chāḷukya race.

We have already referred to the fact that this Vallabha was afflicting the subjects much. The same idea is also conveyed by the application of the epithet *kshata-prajā-bādhaḥ* to Kṛishṇa-rāja who took over his kingdom and relieved the subjects from the oppression of that ruler. We think that *prajābādha* cannot have any reference to Dantidurga. The scheme of the *pras'asti* writer, as could be seen from the way in which Dantidurga is described, was only to praise him and not to denounce him. And he could never have imagined the possibility of a mis-

application of the term in question to any other than Vallabha whom he had introduced in the preceding verse. *Inter alia* the poet has shown the effect of the conquest of Dantidurga viz. that he had brought under his parasol the whole earth from mountain to mountain and from sea to sea :—

āśētōr-vipulāvali-lasal-lōl-ōrmmi-mālā- jalād- ā-prālēya-kalaṁkit-āmala-śilā-jālāt tushār-āchalāt ā-pūrv-āpara-vāri-rāśi-pulina prānta-prasiddh-āvadhīr ēnēyam jagati sva-vikrama-balēna ēkāta-patrīkṛitā. In our opinion there is absolutely nothing in the composition of the *praśasti* writer to show that Dantidurga proved himself so intolerable that his paternal uncle should try to oust him and assume the reins of government. We think it gratuitous to say that Dantidurga "seems to have ultimately made himself unpopular and to have been deposed in favour of his uncle Kṛishṇa I ", and that " Kṛishṇa I uprooted his relative (Dantidurga) who had resorted to evil ways and appropriated the kingdom to himself for the benefit of his family ".

That Dantidurga, after obtaining the kingdom of the Chāḷukyas, did reign long is assured by the statement ' Chāḷukya-Sindhu-mathan-ōdbhava lakshmīm saṁbabhāra chiraṁ ātma-kulaika kāntām '.

And how did he pass away ? Though other inscriptions are silent on this point, the Proddaṭūru inscription tells us that by the entreaties of the damsels of *svargalōka*, he went away to that region while he was yet young. Here one might understand that he met with his death in a battlefield against his enemy, who might be the Vallabha Kīrtivarman or a kinsman of his whom the Rāshṭrakūṭa emperor had set up.

That Kṛishṇarāja, just like his predecessor Dantidurga, had again to conquer the Chāḷukyas in battle and obtain their kingdom,— not that he became heir to this kingdom conquered by Dantidurga is very clearly expressed in the following verse :—

Svayaṁvarībhūta-raṇāṅgaṇē tataḥ sa nirvyapēkshaṁ Śubhatuṅga-Vallabhaḥ chakarsha Chāḷukya-kula-śriyaṁ balād vilōla-

pāli-dhvaja-māla-bhāriṇīm. Akālavarshō hata-bhūpa-rājakō babhūva rājarshir-aśēsha-puṇyakṛit.

Thus from what has been said above it will be seen that after the death of Dantidurga, there was no dispute about the succession of Kṛishṇarāja : in this case, the dispute about succession had been conceived by wrongly equating Vallabha with Dantidurga and making *vaṁs'yd* a kinsman of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family.

The Proddaṭūru incription does not say much about the role or achievements of Kṛishṇarāj I. From the statements of the Baroda plates and others which we have noticed viz. that he removed the sufferings of the people under Vallabha and brought the country under *his own rule*, it may parhaps be inferred that he was already a ruler when he did it. It is not unlikely that while a branch of the family was ruling over the couqnered portion, another branch of it was in charge of the more northern part of the dominions. The earliest inscription of his own time is what is published in the Bharat Itihasa Somsodhak Mandal dated in A. D 758. In the Talegaon plates he is said to have led an expedition against the Western Gaṅgas and to have had his camp at Maṇṇainagar on March 23 of A. D. 768.

The following verse gives us to know that Kāñchi was subject to Kṛishṇa I[1] :—

> Nityaṁ sā prakṛiti-sthir-ātata-chalā varṇṇ-ōjjvalā suprajā-
> ślāghyā sad-vishay-ōpabhōga-subhagā bhāvair bhṛiśaṁ bhūshitā ।
> viśrabdhaṁ kaṭaka-prasādhita-tanur viśvaṁbharā-bhōginā
> bhuktā yēna chiraṁ nijēva vanitā-Kāñchī guṇ-ālaṅkṛitā ॥

As it is said of his son Gōvinda that he was a very Mandara mountain in churning the ocean of battle and an axe to the multitude of wicked foes[2], it is certain that he rendered invalu-

1. Ep. Ind. Vol. XIII. p 280, v.16.
2. *Ibid* p 282.

able aid to his father in the latter's military operations. That Krishṇa I had hard fights with the Western Chāḷukyas is let known to us in many inscriptions. The Cambay plates tell us that he destroyed the vast race of the Chāḷukyas[1] :—

Tasy-ādyam nṛipatēḥ pitṛivya dayī śrī-vīrasiṁhāsanaṁ mērōḥ śṛiṅgam iv ādhiruhya ravivach chhrī-Kṛishṇarāja stataḥ। dhvast ōrikts Chaḷukya-vaṁśa-timiraḥ pṛithivī bhṛitāṁ mastakē nya sth-āṅghṛiḥ sakalaṁ jagat pravitatais tējōbhir ākrantavān ॥

The Wani grant of A.D. 807 says that Kṛishṇa I quickly tore away the goddess of fortune from the Chāḷukya family, which was hard to be overcome by others,[2] and the Baroda grant adds that he transformed into a deer *i.e.* put to flight the great boar *i.e.* the Chāḷukyas, which was seized with an itching for battle and which kindled with the warmth of bravery attacked him. Wani and Rādhanpūr plates speak of Kṛishṇa I "as having with the aid of gods in the form of counsellors or followers, churned the ocean of the Chāḷukya race which had been resorted to by mountains in the shape of kings afraid of their wings or power being destroyed — an ocean that was inaccessible to others — and drawn out from it the Lakamī" of paramount sovereignty. The statement that Kṛishṇa drew out Lakshmī of paramount sovereignty by churning the ocean of the Chāḷukyas will be seen to agree well with the description in the Proddaṭūru inscription, Vēśyēva etc. Others describe him as extending his sovereignty by conquering a certain Rāhappa and obtained supreme sovereignty resplendent with numerous *pālidhvaja* banners.[3] We do not countenance the view that the credit of overthrowing the W. Chāḷukyas really belonged to Dantidurga and that it was foisted by later charter writers on Kṛishṇa I.

Finally, before proceeding, a word may be said about Rāhappa by defeating whom Kṛishṇa I is said to have obtained

1. *Ibid.* Vol. VII.p. 37, v. 8.
2. Ind. Ant. Vol. XI. p 160.
3. Bom. Gaz. p. 391.

the dignity of Rājādhi-rāja-Paramēśvara and about whose identity there is so much doubt and difficulty. The verse which describes the achievement runs thus :—

Rāhappam ātma-bhuja-jāta-balāvalēpaṁ ājau vijitya niśitāsi-latā prahāraiḥ ।
Pālidhvajāvali-subhām achirēṇa yō hi Rājādhirāja-paramēś-varatāṁ tatāna ॥

I would only requ[illegible]t you to compare this verse with the one quoted above (*svayaṁvarī-bhūta-raṇāṅgaṇe* etc.,). Without any comment it will be admitted that what is expressed in the verse about Rāhappa by the words " *Rāhappam:ājau vijitya-Pālidhvajāvali-subhāṁ Rājādhirāja-Paramēs'varatāṁ tatāna* " is conveyed in the other verse by " *Raṇāṅgaṇāhata-bhūpa-rājakō Pālidhvaja-māla-bhāriṇīṁ Chālukya-kulas'riyaṁ chakarsha* " This establishes the identity of Rāhappa with the king or chief of the Western Chāḷukya country at the time of Kṛishṇa I. That the *Pālidhvaja* was the supreme dignity of the Chāḷukyas is expressed in numerous copper-plates of the Western Chāḷukyas ~~in the~~ *"Pālidhvajādi samasta Pārama-is'varyya chihnasya"* and *"sakala-pāramais'varyya-vyakti hētu-pālidhvajādy-ujjvala prājya-rājyō"*. *Pālidhvajā* was the *chihnh* of suprime sovereignty of the W. Chāḷukyas.

From what has been said above, it will be seen that though the Western Chāḷukyas had been defeated by Dantidurga, the members belonging to the family continued to exist with regal powers and the *insignia* of royalty and that they did not fail to seize opportunities that afforded themselves, to offer resistance to the rulers of the newly set up kingdom and to try to assert their independence again and again. This will be more evident in the sequel. Here, perhaps, it will be enough to say that the limited territory of the supplanted Western Chāḷukyas was closely under the watch of, and contiguous to that part of the Rāshṭrakūṭa country which was under the charge of the younger branch of the family and which seems to have consisted of northern and western portions of the dominion bordering on Gujerat. We

have shown that the kings of the Western Chāḷukyas continued to be called by the ancient titular designation of Vallabba and their banner was still *Pālidhvaja.* The larger portion of the Rāshṭrakūṭa dominon in the South consisting of the eastern and southern divisions, touching the borders of Vēṅgi, Pallava, Bāṇa and Western Gaṅga territories, was under the rule of the older branch. To this main line the other branch was more or less subordinate. This kind of apportionment may be supposed to have been made before the demise of Dantidurga and Kṛishṇa rāja, the father's younger brother of Dantidurga, might well be the first king of the branch and held the position as ruler before he subjugated the Western Chāḷukyas and became the ruler of that country sometime after Dantidurga. The division was perhaps necessitated by the new extension of the Rāshṭrakūṭa dominion when Dantidurga's predecessors extended their territory and Dantidurga conquered the Western Chāḷukya country, and particularly deprived the Chāḷukya king of his power. The Rāshṭrakūṭas could not have been unaware of the fact that they will not be left in undisputed possession of the new acquisition by the surrounding powers *i. e.* the Western Chāḷukyas, Pallavas, Bāṇas and Western Gaṅgas. The division is quite akin to and might have been copied from the Chāḷukyas themselves. A later adoption of the procedure may be found among the Chōḷas: Rājēndra Chōḷa I is said to have left the Pāṇḍya country which he conquered under a viceroy who was of the royal line of the Chōḷas.

Gōvinda II and Dhruva

That Gōvinda II was a valorous prince and proved himself useful to his father in the wars undertaken by him is well borne out by the description given of him both in the record of Kṛishṇa I and in the Alas plates issued while Gōvinda was a *Yuvarāja.* That his succession must have been determined by his father is certain by the investiture of the title *yuvarāja.* The Proddaṭūru inscription furnishes useful information as regards Gōvinda II

which serves to remove some of the misconceptions entertained previously regarding his rule and the attitude of his younger brother towards him In the first place it does not tell us that his succession was at all disputed. the following is the verse[1] that speaks of Gōvinda II :—

> Tasmād-abhūt sūnur udāra-kīrttiḥ Prabhūtavarshō bhuvam āśasāda yat-sēnān-īndra-mada-mardhanāt Gāṅgō yō Yāmunivad vibhāti ॥

From this, we learn that he came quite regularly after his father and ruled the dominion (*bhuvaṁ āsasāda*). This statement of the Proddaṭūru inscription clearly proves the incorrectness of the inference that " the successor of Kṛishṇa I was his younger son Dhruva and that Gōvinda II had no real part in the succession at all[2] ". Not only did Gōvinda II succeed his father Kṛishṇa I and rule the kingdom, but that during his rule,— short as it was,— he smashed a certain foe. The result of the action was that it made the Gaṅga appear as Yamunā which in plain language perhaps means that he inflicted a signal defeat on the Gaṅga king. Gaṅga Yamunā figure among the insignia of royalty of the Chāḷukyas. The Baroda plates state that Gōvinda III " after taking away simultaneously from his enemy the rivers Gaṅga and Yamunā, coming through their waves, attained to the best and highest rank, by means of the display of the actual signs of these rivers.[3] "

The Proddaṭūru incription then proceeds to tell us, in verse 8, which ruṇs thus, how Dhruva became king :—

> Ratipatir-uru-bhāvē darśanāt sundarīṇām surata .... dhattē tatra bhūpē-nujasya । Dhruva iti nṛipatitvē mantribhis-ch ābhishiktē Nirupama iti bhūmau ma . . . . budhō-pi

The Dēoli and Karhad plates say that Gōvinda himself gave over the administration to his younger brother Dhruva as he was

1. v. 7.
2. Ep. Ind. Vol. VII. p. 230.
3. Ind. Ant. Vol. XII p 159, text lines, 22-3

excessively indulging in sensual pleasures. [1] This is very important as it settles at once that there was no one placed over the Rāshṭrakūṭa kingdom between Gōvinda II and Dhruva: there is absolutely no room at all for thinking that the elder was overthrown or ousted by the younger. The statement of the Proddaṭūru inscription, it is needless to say, only confirms the report made in the copper plates that "sensual pleasures made Gōvinda careless of his kingdom, and that he entrusted fully the universal sovereignty to his younger brother, allowed his position as sovereign to become loose [2]". This willing resignation of kingly powers by Gōvinda, we are disposed to think, must have been made in the best interest of government and of the family, so that in the indulgence of sensual pleasures he might not be hampered by any care of the State and no blame on that score might also be thrown on him. Dr.Buhler's holding[3] that Gōvinda II was dethroned by his younger brother Dhruva receives no support. Some plates employ the phrase '*Jyēshṭhōllaṅghana*' with reference to Dhruva, and some others omit to mention Gōvinda II while giving the genealogy. From these Dr. Fleet inferred a complete supercession of Gōvinda. The same authority adds that Dhruva made an attempt to secure the succession to himself, and this, he says, is shown by a statement in the Paithan grant of A. D. 796, which, according to him, means that he called to his assistance even the hostile kings of Māḷwā, Kāñchi and Vēṅgi and of the Gaṅga country. [4] We shall refer to the real statement in the Paiṭhan grant later. But here it may be noted that on the face of the express statement that Gōvinda

1. Ep. Ind. Vol IV. p 278 ff
2. Gōvindarāja-iti tasya babhūva nāmnā sūnussa bhōga-bhara-bhaṅgura rājya-chintaḥ |
   Ātmānujē Nirupamē vinivēs'ya samyak sāmrājyam is'vara padaṁ s'ithilī chakāra.
   Ep. Ind. Vol. V. p. 193 : also Karhad plates *Ibid.* Vol IV. p. 298.
3. Ind. Ant. Vol. VI. p 62.
4. Bom. Gaz. Vol. I. pat II., p 393.

himself gave over the kingdom to Dhruva, we are precluded from attributing to the word *ullanghana* any more sense than the transgression of (the usual) order which the action of Gōvinda certainly involved. The gift itself speaks to the perfect good feeling that must have existed between the brothers. The gift was followed by the anointment of Dhruva as sovereign by the ministers (*mantribhir-abhishiktē*). Thus according to the account of the plates the succession of Dhruva was not disputed and there was no room for any dispute. It is plain also that there was no hostility between the two brothers. Under the circumstances we are made to understand that there were two anointed kings at the time of which we are speaking, in the Rāshṭrakūṭa kingdom. One *de jure* anointed by Kṛishṇa I and the other *de facto* anointed by the ministers without bearing any ill-will. The Daulatabad inscription tells us how Dhruva came to bear the burden of the kingdom that was actually placed under another,— another here meaning Gōvinda II,—with perfect devotion to the elder and how it was abandoned (by his brother king who was given up to sensual pleasures). The verse under reference is[1] :—

> Tasyānujō Nirupamas tam udīrṇam īkshya tyaktaṁ nṛipair api nayēna vilupyamānaṁ । rājyaṁ babhāra guru-bhaktivatō-anya-saṁsthaṁ mābhūt kil ānvaya-parichyutir atra lakshmyāḥ ॥

In the interpretation of this verse some differences exist and we note two renderings below :—

Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar has "His younger brother was Nirūpama, who, perceiving him self-conceited, abandoned by (feudatory) princes, and even devoid of policy, assumed the royal authority, placed (in the hands of) other than one possessed of devotion for the predecessors, in order that the sovereignty might not deviate from the family." (Ep. Ind. Vol. XXII. p.

1. Verses 18 to 20 occur in the Jethwai and Bhor museum plates with the same numbers: verses 21 and 22 occur in the Bhor museum and Paithaṇ inscriptions.

103.) Dr. Altekar remarking on this verse has " The Daulatabad plates describe how Gōvinda had to be deposed by Dhruva in the interest of the family, as he had entrusted the administration to some stranger and was being deserted by the feudatories. " (p. 49 n). The use of the word *anya-saṁsthaṁ* in the above has led to the conjecture that Gōvinda II set up one that was not of the family, to rule over the Rāshṭrakūṭa kingdom and that Dhruva had to wrest it from him. The verse only tells us that Dhruva bore the burden of the kingdom that was placed in the hands of another, actuated by the thought that the country should not be lost to the family. *Anyasaṁsthaṁ* has reference to Gōvinda who, as we know, was anointed to the kingdom by his father and not to any stranger. The Karhad and the Proddaṭūru records remove all possible doubts by expressly saying that the kingdom, which was ruled by Gōvinda II, was bestowed by him on his younger brother; and the Paiṭhaṇ plates and one of the Bhor museum records affirm that Dhruva's mind remained unchanged towards his brother and that he gave him gold and ornaments. Dhruva, like his predecessors, had to wage a war with Vallabha which he did and captured his adversary's banner called *pālidhvaja*. Among other achievements, Dhruva is said to have imprisoned a Gaṅga king and taken elephants from a Pallava king. As the verses have led to series of inferences resulting in the establishment of inveterate hatred between the brothers Gōvinda II and Dhruva and the consequent actions and counter-actions, we may go through them here.

Verse 17 states that Kṛishṇarāja went to the world of gods.

Verse 18 speaks of his eldest son Gōvinda II and of his valour, and states that by him the king styled Vallabha was conquered in battle.

Verse 19 speaks in general terms of Gōvinda's younger brother Dhruva and states that by his prowess the entire circle of enemies had been calmed down.

Verse 20 which may be regarded as a character sketch of Dhruva's rule, says that there was perfect cotentment in the world when the kingdom came under this good lord, the ornament of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family, who was truthful, self-controlled, and was a storehouse of good qualities and steady in his devotion to truth : and all the people right up to the end of the ocean pursued the path of the *dharma*.

Verse 21 specifies the hostile kings *i.e.* the lords of Kāñchi, the princes of Gaṅga and Vēṅgi, the lords of Māḷavā, and Prāchya whom he (Dhruva not Gōvinda) brought home : and states that even then *i. e.* when he was in the height of power, he kept his mind unchanged towards his brother and bestowed on him ornaments of gems and gold.

Verse 22, the last verse, states that seeing that Vallabha could not be reconciled by any of the (three) reconciliatory measures adopted, Dhruva had to adopt the fourth expedient of war against him and to defeat him. By so doing he obtained the permanent sovereignty of (*Paramēs'varatvam*) decorated with the *Pālidhvaja*.

On the import of the last two verses Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar notes in Ep.Ind.Vol.XXII.p.103 f, that 'the Paiṭhaṇ plates furnish in two stanzas the following. " Although he (Gōvindarāja) brought kings in numbers, hostile as they were (such as) the ruler of Māḷavā and so forth, joined by the lord of Kāñchi, the Gaṅga and the prince of Vēṅgi, he (Dhruvarāja) gave ruby ornaments and a quantity of gold, and, over and above that, kept his mind unchanged towards (his) brother. Thereafter, when even after conciliation and other remedies, Vallabha (Gōvinda) did not make peace, (Dhruvarāja) the great ruler speedily vanquished him in a battle offered by the brother, expelled the enemies from the east and the north and secured the sovereignty decorated with the insignia of the effulgent *pālidhvaja* ". In foot note 4 on page 108 of the same volume, the editor of the Epigraphia writes ' This verse (22) may be translated as follows :—

" When the Vallabha (i. e. Gōvinda II) did not make peace through conciliatory measures then, the great and mighty lord (*mahēnō-vibhuḥ* *i.e.* Dhruva) forthwith defeated him in a battle in which the army consisted of the four divisions and, therefore, obtained the entire sovereignty of the king, decorated with the emblems of *pālidhvaja* glittering in the East, North, West and the South ".

In this last mentioned rendering of verse 22 which seems to be perfect, I would only qnestion the equation of Vallabha with Gōvinda II, for there is no warrant for it. Vallabha here, as in the case of the verse describing Krishṇarāja I's conquest, refers to the Western Chāḷukya ruler to whom alone the *Pālidhvaja* banner is appropriate, as distinctly borne out by numerous references. For verse 21 I adopt the translation of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar omitting the equation of Gōvindarāja for the pronoun 'he' which clearly refers to Dhruva. The whole verse describes Dhruva's victory over the several kings mentioned, and states at the end that he did not alter his regard for his brother, even in the height of his glory. That Dhruva had conquered the Western Gaṅga and Pallava kings is clearly conveyed also in the following verse occurring in the Jethwai plates in place of verse 21, just quoted from the Paiṭhaṇ plates:—

yōsau prasādhita-jagatrayasāra-durggō Gaṅgaugha-santati nirōdha-vivriddha kīrttiḥ ı

Ātmīkṛit-ōnnata-Vṛishāṅka vibhūtir-uchchair-vyaktaṁ tatāna Paramēśvaratām-ih aikaḥ ||

As for the verse 22, we may safely take the rendering of the Editor of the Epigraphia Indica, here again, omitting the equation of Vallabha with Gōvinda. That the *Pālidhvaja* banner belonged to the enemy of the Rāshṭrakūṭa and not to the Rāshṭrakūṭa king had been made evident from numerous references in the Western Chāḷukya and Rāshṭrakūṭa records. The following is [redacted] one more [redacted] (v. 25 f) which speaks of Gōvinda IV) :—

Yad-adhi dig-vijayāvasarē sati prasabha sambhramā-bhāvan ayēva bhūḥ Sapadi nrityati pāli-mahādhvaj-ōchchhrita-karanga-kunātha-vivarjjitā

which had been translated by Dr. D. R Bhandarkar thus :—

"On the occasion of the conquest of the quarters, the Earth, with uplifted hands (consisting of) mighty *pālidhvaja* and abandoning other kings, forthwith quivers, as if by the causing of a violent bustle (as a woman, when freed from an evil lord dances with uplifted hands as if through intense joyous excitement" Here *Pālidhvaja* is clearly one borne by the enemy king and wrested from him. The simile makes it plain.

Thus, there is nothing in this account of Dhruva and his brother to hint any kind of animosity between them, much less of any revolutionary motives. All the wrong notions have arisen by equating Vallabha with Gōvinda II. Though the epithet Vallabha itself is sufficient to stamp the enemy of Dhruva as a Western Chāḷukya, there is the additional clinching proof afforded by the pālidhvaja banner which he is said to have had.

When once the real position is conceived that Gōvinda II was actually at the head of the Rāshṭrakūṭa kingdom for a few years after the demise of Krishṇarāja I, being anointed thereto by his father, as the title *yuvarāja* assumed by him even when his father was alive shows, his rule being confirmed by the statement in the Proddaṭūru inscription, and that Gōvinda, in his turn, gave over the management of the kingdom to his younger brother Dhruva, himself not ceasing to exist or being divested of the authority once vested with him, and that Dhruva, a *dhārmika* king, with perfect good regard for his elder brother, accepted the charge that was entrusted to him, not with any greed for power or of selfish gain, but purely out of the thought of saving the kingdom from becoming a prey to the enemy and to retain it for the family of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, and was regularly anointed as (an additional) king by the ministers, there will be nothing surprising or untoward if we find that some of the records of the

time are dated in the reign of or issued under the orders of either of the two kings. Thus, the Pimpāri plates issued in S'aka 697 recognising Dhruva as sovereign, and the Dhūlia grant of Karkarāja, son of Dhruva, issued in the reign of and under the orders of Gōvinda II some years later *i.e.* in S'aka 701, are in perfect order: There is nothing to stamp either of them as spurious on consideration of their dates. We need not go about finding any special arguments to say why the documents were issued in the reign of the respective kings whose names they contain.

That Gōvinda II was addicted to sensual pleasures to the extent of neglecting the kingdom that was placed in his charge is well proclaimed in the Rāshṭrakūṭa records. That other kings must have abandoned or shunned him, there is no doubt. But that he was ever ousted by his own younger brother Dhruva, is an assumption completely lacking in authority and incapable of being justly maintained. Gōvinda was a proved soldier. While he was yet an heir-apparent, he defeated the lord of Vēṅgi. And during the short peirod when he held the reins of government, he conducted a successful war against one called Vallabha. Passion outweighing kingly authority, he deliberately chose to entrust the kingdom to his younger brother, who was much devoted to him and was firmly established in *dharma*. There was no fear of his ever being imposed upon. He could not have been unconscious of the fact that his position would become loose by the action he did. In what he had done, it must be said that he had displayed sound judgement. And there is no doubt that he must have been quite conscious of his own strength and the strength of his younger brother. The safety of the kingdom under the circumstances lay only in the step which he had boldly taken.

That there was amity and good will between the two brothers is in evidence by Gōvinda's gift of the kingdom to Dhruva, by the choice terms in the Rāshṭrakūṭa records in describing Dhruva such as *na kṛitaṁ chētō anyathā bhrātaraṁ* and by the gift of orna-

ments of rubies and quantities of gold made by Dhruva to Gōvinda II. It is perhaps enough to say that the estrangement of feeling between Gōvinda and Dhruva is the result of construing the term *anyasaṁsthaṁ* as meaning ' a stranger ' and the application of the term Vallabha to Gōvinda II. The use of the term *Jyēshṭhōllaṅghana* has also something to do with it

If Dantidurga had the credit of bringing the Rāshṭrakūṭa family to the forefront by inflicting a signal defeat on the army of the W. Chāḷukyas which had the unique reputation of having overcome all the great powers, and perhaps also sacrificed his life on the field of battle; and if Krishṇa I had laid the family on a firm basis, firstly by pursuing the fight and killing the Chāḷukyan foe, thus, removing the nominee who was straying away from the path and was oppressing the subjects, and lastly with the aid of his heroic son Gōvinda, reduced the E. Chāḷukya, Pallava, W. Gaṅga and others; Dhruva, the *dhārmic* king, seizing the opportunity wisely afforded by his elder brother, proved to the world that the trust reposed on him was well deserved, by striking terror in the minds of all the neighbouring powers by his heroic deed of leading to the capital almost all the hostile kings, and lifted up the glory of the family, and laid well the foundation of its greatness at no distant date. This is what we have been able to gather so far, from the documentary evidences available to us.[1] We do not find any disputed succession, internecine war or revolution. Firmly established in righteousness, he gave the greatest satisfaction to the world of subjects by following the ancient precepts, being a fearless and active military leader, he won laurels in several fields with the aid of his powerful cavalry force, whose valour is acknowledged both in the Rāshṭrakūṭa and Gaṅga records. Being sagacious and far-sighted, he employed his valiant sons and feudatories in the government of the conquered countries all round, to prevent insurrections, and raised one of them as *yuvarāja*, while yet he was alive, so that no internal strife might disfigure the history of the family, though

---

1 Ind. Ant·Vol. XI, p. 125 ff.

perhaps, modesty and regard for the feelings of the senior and the confidence of his strength to meet any future impediment, that might come in the way of getting his throne, made the prince express satisfaction at the position he was holding directly under the sovereign, his father. Vatsa, Kōsala, Mālva, Gauḍa, Pallava, W. Gaṅga as well as the Eastern and western Chāḷukyas were made to yield submission to Dhruva. If one of the kings should be called the great, it will be hard to decide if Dhruva is entitled to it or his son.

Gōvinda III seems to have conducted several wars against the Pallavas of Kāñchi. The first of these took place some time before A.D. 804 when, being encamped at Rāmēśvaratīrtha, on his return from Kāñchi, he renewed a grant made by Kīrtivarman II. The Pallava opponent is here stated to be Dantiga *i. e.* Dantivarman (A. D. 761–812). The Pallavas did not quietly bear the Rāshṭrakūṭa yoke. Gōvinda III's Radhanpur plates dated in A. D. 808, distinctly speak of a second invasion against the Pallavas. It is stated here :—

"Having passed the rainy season, when the sky is densely covered with thick clouds, at Śrībhuvanaṁ, Gōvinda III went from there with his forces to the banks of the Tuṅgabhadrā, and staying there, strange to say, even by flinging it again, completely drew to himself the fortune of the Pallavas, though it was already in his hands". This verse clearly refers to two distinct invasions by the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Gōvinda III against the Pallavas, the earlier one of which, as pointed out already, took place prior to A. D. 804. The Nilgund inscription of Amōghavarsha I referring to Gōvinda III states that "having fettered the people of Kēraḷa, Mālva and Gouḍa, and together with the Gūrjaras those who dwelt in the hill-fort of Chitrakūṭa, and the lords of Kāñchi, he became known as Kīrtinārāyaṇa.[1]" From the use of the plural *Kāñchīssān* in this verse, it looks as if that Gōvinda III conquered not only Dantivarman, as reported

1. Ep. Ind. Vol. VI. p. 205f. v 6.

in the British Museum and Radhanpur plates, dated in A. D. 804 and 808, but also his successor Teḷḷāṟṟeṟinda Nandivarman III (A. D. 812-844), who aided him in crowning Śivamāra Saigoṭṭa[1]. Thus, Gōvinda III seems to have thrice defeated the Pallavas, the last being in about A. D. 812-3.

When speaking of the combined reigns of Gōvinda II and Dhruva his younger brother, we noticed the successful wars waged by Dhruva against the hostile kings of Kāñchi, Gaṅga, Vēṅgi, Mālava, and the highly irreconcilable Vallabha and the humiliation caused to them. Besides being defeated, one was put in fetters, another was forced to bow down before the conqueror, a third was driven into the desert, the fourth had his state umbrella of sovereignty destroyed and the fifth was deprived of his flags. All these proud and independent kings cannot be expected to have put up for any length of time with the insults that had been flung at them. It must be mainly as a result of these actions of Gōvinda II and Dhruva, that Gōvinda III had, almost at the commencement of his reign, to face the combined action of a confederacy of chiefs, who, it is believed, were apparently led by a person named Stambha.[2] Here we shall trace the events which brought the Rāshṭrakūṭas in touch with the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas.

In the early part of this paper, we have shown how the various powers of South India stood at the time of the rise of the Rāshṭrakūṭas and stated also the attitude of these powers among themselves. With one of these *i. e.* the Western Chāḷukyas, whom the Rāshṭrakūṭas had overthrown and whose territory of seven and a half lakshas they had practically brought under subjection placing nominally a *vaṁśya* on the throne, the members of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family had to be ever, after fighting. It will not be right to assume that the Western Chāḷukyas had

1. *Ibid*, Vol. V. p.

1. Ind. Ant. Vol. V. p. 150; *Ibid*, Vol. VI, pp. 62 & 70; Vol. IX, p. 161; and Bom. Gaz. p. 395.

vanished after Dantidurga or his successor had defeated them. On the other hand, there are clear evidences to show that they continued to exist, and, finally getting the better of the adversary, recovered the territory which they had originally lost. These descendants of the Western Chāḷukyas of Bādāmī are referred to in the Rāshṭrakūṭa records of successive generations as Vallabha, as having the boar for their emblem, as having the *pālidhvaja* banner, etc. Thus far, we have shown that every king of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line had his share of fight with the Western Chāḷukyas. The next power with which the new conquerors had naturally to contend in their southern abode was the Pallava whose allies were the Bāṇas and Gaṅgas. Every one of the Rāshṭrakūṭa kings from Dantidurga to Gōvinda III, claims to have over-thrown the Pallavas. It is significant that there is not a corresponding claim on the other side. Had success attended the Pallavas in any of their encounters with the Rāshṭrakūṭas, we could reasonably expect the fact to be mentioned in their eulogies. The omission can only indicate that the Pallavas fared ill. To visualise the contemporaneity of the Pallavas, Rāshṭrakūṭa, W. Gaṅga and Pāṇḍya rulers we give a table below. From it, it will be seen that the latter part of the reign of Nandivarman Pallavamalla (A. D. 696–761) synchronised with the reign of Dantidurga and the early years of Kṛishṇarāja I, and that the single long reign of the Pallava Dantivarman (A. D. 761–812) covered the rest of the reign of Kṛishṇarāja, the combined rule of Gōvinda II and his younger brother Dhruva Dhārāvarsha as well as the reign of Gōvinda III. It must have been with the Pallava Dantivarman that the four Rāshṭrakūṭa kings mentioned above must have fought. Dantivarman must have been taken over by the victorious Dhruva to his capital. It has been shown above that Gōvinda III defeated Dantivarman at least twice: and that the privilege exercised by the early Pallava kings Siṁhavarman and Skandavarman viz. the crowning of the Western Gaṅga king, was now jointly exercised by Nandivarman III and Gōvinda III,

in fastening the fillet of royalty on 'Sivamāra II Śaigoṭṭa, who had not for long been captured and put in prison by Dhārāvarsha-Dhruva, about which we shall speak presently. Gōvinda III's reign ended soon after the last noticed event. The constant inroads into the Pallava dominion by the above named four Rāshṭrakūṭa kings during the reign of the Pallava Dantivarman must, no doubt, have considerably weakened the latter's power, which, at the end of that king's rule, was over-run by the Pāṇḍyas. The Pāṇḍyas under the lead of Varaguṇa Mahārāja I, who ascended the throne in A. D. 811 pushed their way as far north as Araiśūr on the north bank of the Peṇṇār river and made Nandivarman III (A. D. 812-844) acknowledge the overlordship of the Pāṇḍyas. The existence of the inscriptions of Varaguṇa-Mahārāja at Kuṁbakōṇam, Tiruviśalūr, Aḍuturai, Tillaisthānam and Lālguḍi proves the reality of his claim and the last epigraph establishes his suzerainty over Nandivarman III the victor of Teḷḷāṟu

We may now notice the conflict of the Rāshṭrakūṭas with the Western Gaṅgas as it is one requiring some light. The conflict seems to have commenced as early as A. D. 786 when, according to the Talegaon plates, Kṛishṇa I had pitched his camp at Maṇṇe on the occasion of his victorious expedition against the Gaṅgas. The Western Gaṅga king at the time was Śrīpurusha. This was followed by other invasions in the subsequent reigns of Dhruva and GōvindaIII. We shall start with a statement made in the Maṇṇe grant. It tells us that the Western Gaṅga king " Śivamāra II made himself famous by his victories over the armies of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, the Chāḷukyas and the Haihayas, when they were encamped at a village named Mudukundūr and that he defeated the countless cavalry of Dhruva which had over-run the whole earth." This statement cannot be a mere boast but a simple record of fact, admitting in a way, the superiority of the enemy. From the admission it should be inferred that Dhruva had gained clear advantages over the Gaṅgas, and that the cause of action for Śivamāra's fight with the Rāshṭrakūṭas arose

therefrom. The previous action, as elsewhere stated, was to the effect that the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa's son Dhruva-Dhārā-varsha- Nirupama seized and imprisoned the Gaṅga king of the Chēṛa country and that his son Raṇāvalōka Kambaya was made the ruler of Gaṅgavāḍi 96,000. The Gaṅga king at the time must have been the same Śrīpurusha-Muttarśa against whom Kṛishṇa I led an expedition : and the prince of the family of the Gaṅgas 'that was ruling over the Chēra country' whom Dhruva is said to have detained in custody, must have been a provincial governor connected with the Gaṅga family and not Śivamāra himself. The Maṇṇe grant seems to admit the defeat inflicted by Dhruva on Śrīpurusha-Muttaraśa ; and for detaining in custody one of the Gaṅga princes, and for retrieving the losses previously sustained, Śivamāra, when he became king, fought with Dhruva and gained a victory. Subsequent to this, there must have been another conflict between the two kings in which Śivamāra should have met with a reverse. On this occasion, which may be placed about the end of the rule of Dhruva, Śivamāra must have been captured and put in the Rāshṭrakūṭa prison, for it is distinctly stated that as soon as Gōvinda III came to the throne, he set Śivamāra at liberty. We have to state here the view taken of the statement of the Maṇṇe grant cited above. It is as follows :—

"Śivamāra II may very well have been entrusted with the command in some war between his father and Dhruva. And we may suppose that during the campaign, he (Saigoṭṭa) was eventually defeated, captured and imprisoned by Dhruva, and that on Muttaraśa's death, he was liberated by Gōvinda III, in order to succeede to the leadership of the Gaṅgas, on which occasion, the Rāshṭrakūṭa king would have very likely, crowned him,— as the spurious Maṇṇe grant asserts,— with some feudatory crown. The event may be placed about A. D. 805. The same passages in the Rāshṭrakūṭa records tell us that, after no long time, Gōvinda III found it necessary to conquer the Gaṅga, who through excess of pride stood in opposition to him and to put him

fetters, again in A. D. 810. And it was doubtless this second imprisonment of Śivamāra II that let in his younger brother Raṇavikrama to the Western Gaṅga-succession".

For chronological purposes, Śrīpurusha's reign is one of the land-marks in the history of the Western Gaṅgas. His initial year is beyond question, fixed by the two charters, the Jawāli and Nāgamaṅgala plates, the former combining the 25th year of reign with Śaka 672 (A.D. 750) and the latter coupling the 50th year with Śaka 696 (A.D. 776). His latest year is furnished in the Hulkūr lithic record dated in Śaka 710 (A.D. 788) which must have been his 52nd year of reign. There is nothing to indicate at present, that his reign extended beyond A.D. 788. Thus, there is warrant for holding that when the Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa I (A. D. 756-775) led an expedition against the Western Gaṅga territory and was encamped at the city of Maṇṇe in A. D. 768, the king of the latter country was Śrīpurusha (A. D. 725-788), and that he was also the king against whom Dhruva (A.D.775-794) directed his arms. Almost all the records of Dhruva's reign refer to his success over the Western Gaṅgas.

Śrīpurusha was succeeded by his eldest son Śivamāra II Saigoṭṭa in circa A.D. 788, and we have noted his claim to have become famous by defeating the cavalry of Dhruva, which is expressly said to have overcome the whole earth. It seems certain that Dhruva met with some reverses at the end of his reign, though this loss was soon retrieved by himself by taking Śivamāra captive. On this occasion, it is likely that Śivamāra entrusted the kingdom to Vijayāditya his younger brother. We have the authority of inscriptions to say that Vijayāditya received the Gaṅga kingdom from his elder brother as a trust, as did Bharata from Rāma. After some time, when Gōvinda III became king, Śivamāra II was set at liberty and it is said that, after no long time Gōvinda III, found it necessary to reconquer the Gaṅga, who through excess of pride, stood in opposition to him, and to put him in fetters again. How Śivamāra II came to be released is not stated. If we are allowed to make a conjecture, it may be that it was at the

instance of the Pallava king Dantivarman, who, by reason of his being introduced in the Bāhūr plates as a lineal descendant of the Pallavas and with Western Gaṅga ancestry, might be said to have had a Western Gaṅga princess for his mother· The Vēlūrpāḷayaṁ plates tell us that Dantivarman's mother was Rēvā, and the description given of her union with Nandivarman Pallavamala *viz.*

Tasy āmbū rāśēr iva vāhinīnāṁ nāthasya nānā guṇa-ratna dhāmnaḥ ।

Dhīrasya bhūbhṛit-Varalabdha-janmā Rēvēva Rēvā mahishī babhūva ॥

is plainly suggestive of it. Besides, Nandivarman III's mother Aggaḷanimmadi being a Kadaṁba princess, and Nripatuṅga's mother Saṅkhā being a Rāshṭrakūṭa, Gaṅga ancestry is precluded for these two Pallava kings, who are the only other kings that figure in the genealogical list given in the Bāhūr plates. That the Pallavas were the overlords of the Western Gaṅgas is known to us from numerous early records ; they were directly concerned also in their coronation. There is a fitness in the application of the term *vāhinīnāṁ nātha* to the Pallavas who were hereditarily the overlords of the Gaṅgas.

The first incarceration of Śivamāra II could not have lasted long. Of Vijayāditya it is recorded that he refrained from enjoying the earth, knowing it to be his elder brothers' wife. On release by Gōvinda III, Śivamāra II should have appointed his eldest son Māraśiṁha I as *yuvarāja* and it is not unlikely that he made his position stronger and perhaps, also defied the authority of the Rāshṭrakūṭa viceroy in the Gaṅga territory. The fact that we have records issued by Māraśiṁha I as *Yuvarāja* dated in the years A. D. 797 and 799, show that during the second incarceration of Śivamāra he did not entrust the government of the country to Vijayāditya as he had done in the first instance. The second release in circa A. D. 813 of Śivamāra II might have been made at the instance of Nandivarman. Gōvinda III died shortly after, though Śivamāra II continued to hold the reins of government for about

four years; and Mārasiṁha predeceased him. The new Rāshṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarsha (A D. 813–878), it appears, was not favourably disposed towards Prithivipati the sole remaining son of Śivamāra II. Dissensions in the Western Gaṅga family began to appear, and there are grounds for believing that they were backed up by the Rāshṭrakūṭas who were friendly towards the younger branch *i.e.* the line of Vijayāditya. The members of the senior line *i.e.* of Śivamāra were open enemies of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. In preference to Pṛithivipati I, the legitimate claimant to the Gaṅga throne, Rājamalla I was made to occupy it. On some pretext, Pṛithivipati carried his arms against the Rāshṭrakūṭas and defeated Amōghavarsha I. But finding it of no avail in remaining in the kingdom, he went over and joined the side of the Pallavas, who under Nandivarman III was previously instrumental in getting the final release and re-coronation of his father Śivamāra II, and became their feudatory. He served first under Nṛipatuṅga and then under his successor Aparājita.

Finally we have to say a word about certain statements made by Fleet, which antiquated as they are, are still being adopted by a few to suit their purpose. The statements appear in his article on the Śravaṇa Beḷgōḷa epitaph of Mārasiṁha II (Ep. Ind. Vol. V pages 151 gf.). At the time when he wrote, the kings represented in the Bāhūr plates *viz.* Dantivarman, Nadivarman and Nṛipatuṅga were believed to be of Western Gaṅga origin, owing to the mention of Vimala, Koṅgaṇika and others, as having come in the family of the eponymous Pallava of the Bhāradvāja-gōtra and before Dantivarman. Dr. Hultzsch suggested it, and Dr. Fleet thought it safe to adopt this view. In the wake of Fleet others followed. And when the Maṇṇe grant stated of the Western Gaṅga Śivamāra II " that his forehead was adorned by a fillet (of royalty) placed there with their own hands, when they performed (his) anointment to the sovereignty, by the two ornaments of the Rāshṭrakūṭa and Pallava lineages named Gōvindarāja and Nandivarman, who were (already) anointed on their foreheads". Dr. Fleet, who shared in the view of Dr. Hultzsch,

that Nandivarman of the Bāhūr plates was not a Pallava, was obliged to say (i) " that the Pallava Nandivarman mentioned in the Maṇṇe plates must be Nandivarman Pallavamalla, son of Hiraṇyavamman " and to add that " he (Pallavamalla) cannot have had anything to do with Śivamāra II at so late a time as the date of his succession on the death of Muttaraśa, (ii) and it seems that, mixed up with a real act of Gōvinda III, towards the second Śivamāra, the Maṇṇe grant has preserved an anachronistic reminiscence of a real act of Pallavamalla Nandivarman towards the first Śivamāra *viz.* that on the downfall of the Western Chāḷukyas, he formally recognised Shivamāra and crowned him as the chief, more or less feudatory, of a powerful tribe on the borders of his own outlying province of Noḷambavāḍi ". Further, against the possibility of Nandivarman of the Maṇṇe grant being identified with Vijaya —Nandivikrama-varman, son of Dantivarman, Fleet added in a note (f. n. 3 on p. 158 P, (iii) " it does not at all seem probable, and if it were so, an anachronism in the other direction would be involved : for Nandivarman, the son of Dantivarman, cannot be placed as early as A.D. 797, which is the pretended date of the Maṇṇe grant : he cannot be placed before A.D. 804, which is the date that we have for Dantivarman ". By the way, one more statement had also been made by Fleet and it is the following :—(iv) " we may safely follow Dr. Hultzsch in his inference that the Rāshṭrakūṭa princess Śaṅkhā wife of Nandivarman, was a daughter of Gōvinda's son and successor Nṛipatuṅga Amōgha-varsha I (A.D. 814/5-877/8) after whom her son must have been partly named ".

As regards the identification of Gōvindarāja, Fleet had no doubts and he said " he seems to be the Rāshṭrakūṭā king Gōvinda III, whose reign began about A.D. 783/4 and ended in A.D. 814/5" p. 158). In fact he owns the fastening of the fillet of royalty on Śivamāra II by Gōvindarāja as " a real act of (the Rāshṭrakūṭa) Gōvinda III ". But he was of opinion, as already said, that mixed up with this, the Maṇṇe grant has

preserved an anachronistic reminiscence of a real act of Pallavamalla Nandivarman towards the first Śivamāra which he explains in his own way. There is no epigraphical support for what Dr. Fleet considered a real act of Nandivarman Pallavamalla towards the first Śivamāra.

His explanation is indeed ingenious, to say the least of it. What lay at the bottom of the committal of this mistake was, as plainly admitted by Fleet himself, the belief that the kings represented in the Bāhūr plates were not Pallavas, though the mythical ancestry and the bull crest on the seal, were distinctly Pallava. The discovery of the Velūrpāḷayam plates has dispelled all doubts in the matters and there is no room now for holding any of the kings,-Dantivarman, Nandivarman and Nṛipatuṅga,- to be other than Pallava. The anachronism that would be involved in identifying Nandivarman of the Maṇṇe grant with the Nandivarman of the Bāhūr plates, the sun of Dantivarman, is not so serious as the supposition of the preservation and mixing up of an act of Pallavamalla towards the first Śivamāra which is unsupported by any epigraphical evidence and which involves an ingenious explanation. The former anachronism is not formidable to get over. Such of those that share in the view of Dr. Fleet and are still sceptic about the correctness of the historical information in the Maṇṇe grant may learn the truth from the remarks of Mr. Panchamukhi cited hereunder :—

"*Mārśiṁha has issued, as *yuvarāja*, the Nelamaṅgala and Ālūr copper plates dated respectively in A. D. 797 and A. D. 799. It may be remarked that the view that these two charters are spurious is no longer tenable, since the script employed in them is per fectly regular for the period and closely resembles the writing of the Maṇṇe plates of Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III. Further, the historical-details that are mentioned in them are now corroborated by several genuine Gaṅga grants such as the Kudalur plates of Mārāśiṁha II and the apparently impossible reference in them to the crowning of Śivamāra II by Gōvinda III and NandivarmanIII which took place in about A. D. 813 will have to be explained by

supposing that the grant actually made by Māraśiṁha when his father was in prison was issued after the liberation and recoronation of Śivamāra in A. D. 813, incorporating the events that had happened in the interval ".

Indeed this is the sane view to take in the matter and I am sure it will be endorsed by all those that deal with inscriptions, and do not go about indiscriminately borrowing leaves from others that know how long some grants take to be put in copper plates and finally issued,— the Larger Leiden plates had taken the last eight years of the reign of Rājarāja I and some years of the reign of Rājēndra Chōḷa I,— that care to verify the originals and have the courage of their convictions to express their findings without fear or favour. There could be no doubt that Śivamāra II was a crowned monarch when he was first taken captive.

The reign of Gōvinda III (A. D. 794–814) covered the last five years of the Eastern Chāḷukya king Vishṇuvardhana IV and the first thirteen years of his successor Vijayāditya II. One of the Eastern Chāḷukya grants says that Vijayāditya II fought 108 battles with the armies of the Raṭṭas and Gaṅgas, for twelve years, day and night. and built 108 Siva temples called Narēndrēśvara after his surname.[1] In another grant he is called the destroyer of the party of the Southern Gaṅga and the builder of the temples of Narēndrēśvara.[2] A third is even more specific. It states that " Vijayāditya II fought for twelve years with the generals of Vallabhēndra and that having defeated his own younger brother Bhīma-Śālukki took possession of Vēṅgī-maṇḍala from him ".[3] From these statements it is clear that there was a rival claimant to the Eastern Chāḷukya throne on the death of Vishṇuvardhana IV in the person of Viajayāditya's younger

1. Gaṅga-Raṭṭa-balaihs sārddaṁ dvādaśābdānn ahar niśam ।
bhuj ārjjita-balam khaḍga-sahāyō naya-vikramaih ॥
Ashṭōttaram yudda-śataṁ yuddhvā S'aṁbhōrmahālayān ।
tat-saṅkhyāy ākarōd vīro Vijayāditya-bhūpatih ॥ (S. I. I. Vol. I. p. 39)
2. A. R. on Ep. for 1914, para 6, p. 84 f.
3. *Ibid.* p. 84.

brother and that he was backed up by the generals of a certain Vallabha, and that Vijayāditya had to fight as many as 108 battles not only against the armies of the Raṭṭas and Southern Gaṅgas but also against the generals of Vallabha who were supporting the claim of his younger brother. The generals of Vallabhēndra should have been supporting Bhīma-Śālukki at the instance of the Raṭṭas and Southern Gaṅga king. The Rāshṭrakūṭa king at the time of the demise of the Eastern Chāḷukya Vishṇuvardhana IV *i. e.* in A. D. 799, was Gōvinda III and he must have nominated to the Eastern Chāḷukya throne Bhīma-Śālukki in preference to his elder brother Vijayāditya II, and to support his nominee he must have employed there some of his generals if by Vallabhēndra is meant the Rāshṭrakūṭa king, and the generals of Vallabha whom his father had recently subdued. The forces of the Southern Gaṅga king, who, along with the armies of the Rāshṭrakūṭas under Gōvinda III with whom the legitimate Vijayāditya II had to wage war to obtain his throne and kingdom, must be the W. Gaṅga Vijayāditya, the younger brother of Śivamāra II. Thus the policy adopted by Gōvinda III with regard to the subordinate W. Gaṅga and Eastern Chāḷukya powers was the same. The Rāshṭrakūṭa records tell us that Gōvinda III sent a letter to the Vēṅgi king, who, as soon as the messenger half uttered the command, longing for his own comfort, steadily, like a servant, without ceasing, did toil to construct the outer wall round his capital city. Here one cannot miss to notice that Bhīma-Śāḷukki owed his position to the Rāshṭrakūṭa and was bound to do his behests in order to win his favour and support. It is improbable that the proud victor of 108 battles would deign to cleanse the courtyard of the Rāshṭrakūṭa sovereign, whom he had worsted in numerous engagements. There are no indications that he ever reconciled himself with Gōvinda III.

Gōvinda III dying soon after Vijayāditya II was well established in Vēṅgi, the latter reigned over his dominion for nearly a quarter of a century without any troubles.

Amoghavarsha.

The period of rule covered by the reigns of Amōghavarsha and his descendants is not a bright one in the history of the Rashṭrakūṭas. Amōghavarsha was only a boy of tender years when his father died. His accession is well fixed up to be A. D. 814-5.[1] which falls not long after the latest known date[2] of Gōvinda III *i. e.* A. D. 813, December 4. Amōghavarsha seems to have reigned for at least 63 years.[3]

One of the most important changes effected during the reign of Amōghavarsha I was the shifting of the seat of government to the newly founded city of Malkhēḍ. A city with all the requirements to be a capital cannot rise quickly. It seems to have been planned in the reign of Gōvinda III, and completed in Amōghavarsha's time. Growth of empires from small neuclii had always necessitated the founding of second capitals in more central localities wherefrom it could be easy to watch the counter movements of the new enemies at whose cost the empire had grown. The Pallavas, Western Chāḷukyas and Western Gaṅgas who had been dealt severe blows by the predecessors of GōvindaIII having been in a state of constant revolt, and Gōvinda himself having had to make them acquiese in the Rāshṭrakūṭa overlordship, and further risings of a similar nature and coalition of the subdued powers being expected at any moment, might have prompted Gōvinda III to found the new city. Besides, the Rāshṭrakūṭas had now to meet a more formidable foe in the person of the Eastern Chāḷukya Vijayāditya II (A.D. 799-843), the son of Vishṇuvardhana IV, who had suffered defeat at the hands of Gōvinda II in the reign of Kṛishṇa I and who was one among the hostile kings taken by Dhruva to the Rāshṭrakūṭa country. All these must have strongly urged the necessity of having a city in a more central place and close to the Vēṅgi country, leave alone any ambition on his own part to acquire any fresh territory. The move in this direction must certainly have been taken to bring under complete subjection all the conquered powers and

1. K. 75 and 76. 2. K. 67. 3. K. 80.

to maintain the supremacy over them. Gōvinda III started the work but it was given effect to, only in the reign of his successor Amōghavarsha I.

When Amōghavarsha had come of age, he found that he had to raise the glory of his family which was sunk deep in the Chāḷukyan ocean. We shall see how this came about. The death in A.D. 814 of Gōvinda III leaving only a boy of tender years to succeed him,—which,—at that time required a very powerful ruler at the helm of government to keep under control proud and irreconcilable kings of different houses, who, as often as they were put down, rose up and showed their stubborn nature, and perfect unwillingness to bear the Rāshṭrakūṭa yoke,— afforded a very nice opportunity, for subduring the enemies the like of which had never before occurred, to assert their independence. Nay, had it not been for the previous losses and defeats and the dwindling of the resources of the enemies, one among them could very easily have caused the disruption of the new house of the Rāshṭrakūṭas brought into eminence in the space of three or four generations. The boy emperor was the ward of Karkka the senior member of the Gujerat line of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. We can easily conceive the high responsibilities that Karkka had to shoulder. Besides being the *de facto* ruler of the empire, he had to see that the boy was given proper education and training required of an emperor, that his own life as well as that of the prince under his charge was not endangered, and to meet or put down any risings of the subdued powers. Under these circumstances, the regent could not follow in the footsteps of the deceased emperor Gōvinda III or his predecessors by undertaking any new expeditions or invasions.

Karkka's leaving Gujerat, vacating his throne for Gōvinda, and taking up the position of being the protector of the boy emperor, shows the oneness of feeling that existed between the members of the two branches of the Rāshṭrakūṭa family that were holding Gujerat and Mālkhēḍ. Both were intent on

retaining the advantages gained, and shared in the weal and woe of either. It will be unnatural and preposterous, if a son, grandson or other relative of Karkka raised his little finger against him or the cause he espoused and thereby exhibited ingratitude of the worst type. Unless there is clear evidence, to show that anyone proved a traitor, we cannot be justified in inferring anything that will cast a slur on a family exhibiting the noblest of feelings. The high terms in which Karkka is spoken of in the grant of Gōvinda strongly bear testimony to the cordial relationship of the members. We have here to note how the opportunity was availed of by the subjugated powers viz. the Western Gaṅgas, Eastern Chāḷukyas, Western Chāḷukyas, Pallavas and others. We have noted how the Western Gaṅga Śivamāra II was finally released from the Rāshṭrakūṭa prison, reinstalled on the throne by Gōvinda III, just prior to the latter's demise and how he alienated himself from the Rāshṭrakūṭa overlord: we have also noted how the undaunted Eastern Chāḷukya Vijayāditya II defied the power of the Rāshṭrakuṭas and Western Gaṅgas and wrested the Veṅgi kingdom from his mean younger brother who became a prey to the machinations of the enemy and put himself in war with his elder, backed up as he was by foreign arms, and how, by his indomitable strength he conducted a long war which forced the Rāshṭrakūṭas to found a great city close to the Vēngi kingdom. He had thoroughly become independent of the Rāshṭrakūṭa overlordship excercised during the days of his father Vishṇu-vardhana IV, and regained his kingdom ridding himself of his enemy. The almost independent position of the Pallava could be easily understood by Nandivarman taking an equal share with Gōvinda III in the second crowning of Śivamāra II. It remains now to say about the part played by the Vallabha by which term we have shown the members of the fallen house of the Western Chāḷukyas were called in the inscriptions of Dantidurga, Kṛishṇa and Dhruva. We have indicated above that the kings of this house had entrenched themselves in the confines of the dominion of the

Gujerat branch of the Râshṭrakūṭas. And though they were not prominent in the days of Gōvinda III, they had caused enough trouble to his father Dhruva and did not cease to exist. In the absence of Karkka from his home, acting as regent to the boy emperor, the hereditary Râshṭrakūṭa enemy Vallabha found again an opportunity to rush forth and fall upon his son Dhruva I Dhārāwarsha and killed him in the battlefield. It would even appear that the Vallabha had taken possession of Dhruva's kingdom for a time, for it is said that Dhruva's son Akālavarsha Śubhatuṅga had to wrest his dominion from the enemy. Vallabha did not yield easily. He offered war against Akālavarsha's son Dhruva II also. Thus, three generations of kings of the Gujerat branch had been ceaselessly worsted in battle by the forces of the Vallabha: these Gujerat kings were contemporaries of Amōghavarsha I. It is true that Amōghavarsha used the title Vallabha, as did also many others. But no tangible reasons could be seen in inscriptions to make us believe that he rose against his own Gujerat cousins under the guidance of one of whom he had been brought up. If he, a peace loving religious minded man, should take up arms against the Gujerat house, and show his inveteracy for three generations, there must be very extraordinary grounds. We see no such grounds.

We may say here what gave room for the conception that the reign of Amōghavarsha I was disturbed by rebellions and internecine wars. In a grant made in A. D. 826-7 by the Gujerat Rāshṭrakūṭa chief Gōvinda the younger brother of Karkka, the genealogy of the Rāshṭrakūṭas is taken up to Gōvinda III and no reference of any kind is made in it to Amōghavarsha I. The initial date of Amōghavarsha's reign being definitely known from his Sirūr and other inscriptions to have fallen in A. D. 814, the omission of his name in a grant falling in his reign and made by a Rashṭrakūṭa feudatory, was considered serious. Fleet's explanation of this was "that possibly, when the charter was issued, Gōvindarāja was in

rebellion against his sovereign". He followed up this remark and noted the fact that the charter gave to Gōvinda only the feudatory title of *Mahāsāmantādhipati*, which he knew was somewhat an apparent contradiction. Be that as it may, another satisfactory explanation is now made necessary. At the time Fleet wrote, it was not known Amōghavarsha I was a mere boy when his father died. His anointment as *yuvarāja* did not take place for aught we know. This and his long reign extending to 63 or 64 years, of course counted from the date of demise of his father, are in agreement with what is now known about his age in A. D. 814. Though the regnal year is counted from this date, Amōghavarsha's actual coronation must have taken place only when he came of age. All that the Kāvī grant of Gōvinda could tell us is that there was no overlord to be mentioned, Amōghavarsha I not having been crowned by that time: that Gōvinda held only a feudatory position is correctly indicated by the title he bore,and there was no overlord to be mentioned in his grant. We think there is no room for inferring that Gōvinda raised the standard of revolt against Amōghavarsha I. He is seen satisfied with his position of Mahāsāmantādhipati. It is still a question when Karkka passed away, and when exactly Amōghavarsha's actual coronation took place.

As the Baroda plates, dated A. D. 834-5, of Dhruva I, and the Bagūmra grant of Dhruva II, dated in A. D. 866-7, mention Amōghavarsha as sovereign, he must have assumed regal powers sometime before the first mentioned date. From the omission in these plates of the name of Gōvinda, it had been inferred that Gōvinda was an usurper and a rebel. If it is remembered that these plates belong to the kings of Karkka's line, the omission in them of Gōvinda, a member of the collateral branch, is quite natural. He owed his position to Karkka, who in the interest of both the branches, set up Gōvinda in his place, and went to afford protection to Amōghavarsha. Dhruva might not have come of age at the time. I am unable to find motives for

rebellion of any kind so far as Gōvinda, Dhruva, Akālavarsha -Subhatuṅga and Dhruva II are concerned, and there is no attempt on the part of the Gujerat Rāshṭrakūṭas to subvert Karkka or Amōghavarsha I: on the other hand they were keenly interested in the safety of the Mālkhed empire.

The two plates further state that Karkka " vanquished the tributary Rāshṭrakūṭas, who, after they had voluntarily promised obedience, dared to rebel with a powerful army ; and he speedily placed Amōghavarsha on his throne. Can it not be said that the voluntary promise only shows the loyalty of the subjects and chiefs to the throne and that it must have naturally come when Gōvinda III passed away suddenly leaving an un-anointed son of tender years to succeed him : And Karkka's presence might not have been liked by the proud chieftains of the State, he being only a feudatory. At any rate the wording does not warrant the inference that there was any rebellion against the boy emperor.

When Amōghavarsha actually assumed regal powers, he found to his dismay that the empire reared up by his ancestors had disintegrated, the Western Gaṅgas and the Eastern Chāḷukyas having become almost independent, and the army of the Vallabha trying its best in the same direction. He at once directed his general Baṅkēya to reduce to subjection the Western Gaṅga. While this was so, the ceaseless fighting that was going on between Vallabha and the kings of the Gujerat branch assumed large proportions and Amōghavarsha I who was erstwhile a ward under one of the kings of the same branch, and who had the greatest interest in the Gujerat house could not remain a mere spectator.

It is almost certain that this war which was being waged nearer home must have been a menace to his own dominion of Mālkhed. Of this fact he could not be unaware. When he found that his Gujerat cousins were not a match for the Vallabha, he

must have called in for help his powerful and trusted general Baṅkēya from his command in Gaṅgavāḍi before the work there could be brought to a successful issue.

Amōghavarsha I is said to have gained a victory over the king of Vēṅgi at a place called Viṅgavalli. As is natural, this event does not find mention in the Eastern Chāḷukya grants and it is likely, though not confirmed, that this event took place in the brief reign of Kali Vishṇuvardhana in about A.D. 843–4. Perhaps the Eastern Chāḷukya opponent died on the field of battle. And this may be the reason for the revival of the inveterate enmity between Gaṅga Vijayāditya III and the Rāshṭrakūṭas as well as their allies the Western Gaṅgas, Noḷambas etc.

The Pallava contemporaries of this Rāshṭrakūṭa king were Nandivarman III, his son Nṛipatuṅga, and the latter's successor Aparājita. It has been noted above that the Western Gaṅga Śivamāra was helped to the throne by Nandivarman III and Gōvinda III. There was at the time divided interest in the Western Gaṅga family which seems to have been brought about by the instrumentality of the Rāshṭrakūṭas who were their overlords. Raṇavikrama Vijayāditya, a member of the younger branch having secured the kingdom of Gaṅgavāḍī, Śivamāra's descendants were forced to leave their home and they went over to the Pallava territory and sought employment under its ruler. Thus, we find Pṛithivīpati I figuring as a subordinate both of Nṛipatuṅga and Aparājita. He had once taken up arms against the Rāshṭrakūṭa ruler Amōghavarsha I and defeated him in a field of battle. We know that a certain Chōḷamahārāja Kumārāṅkuśa was in the service of the Pallava king Nandivarman III. Thus, at the time the Pāṇḍya power reached its zenith and that of the Rāshṭrakūṭas was in the lowest ebb, there were under the service of the Pallava, a prince of the Western Gaṅgas of Talakkād and a member of the ancient stock of the Chōḷas. If we have before us the chief events that are said to have taken place, it will be quite

easy to follow the history of South India, from the date of Varaguṇa's dash against the Pallava country. The Pāṇḍya king Śrīmāra Śrīvallabha who led the Pāṇḍyan forces immediately after Varaguṇa I, conquered successively the Kēraḷa, Siṁhaḷa, Pallava and the Vallabha and brought the whole of South India under his rule :—

> Māyāpāṇḍyaṁ Kēraḷaṁ Siṁhaḷēndraṁ jitvā saṁkhyē
> Pallavaṁ Vallabhaṁ cha |
> Ēka-chhatrām mēdinīm-ēka-vīraḥ prārakshad-yaḥ
> prēmapātraṁ prajānāṁ ||

The Tamil portion treating of his military exploits, lets us know that this king gained victories at Kuṇṇar, Siṅghaḷam Viḷiñam; and that when the Gaṅga, Pallava, Chōḷa, Kaliṅga and Magadha came forth and opposed him in the battlefield at Kumbakhōṇam he caused them to be bathed in a big river of blood. These events happened in the period A.D. 832-862, the last date marking the end of his reign. The reigning Rāshṭrakūṭa king of Mālkhed at the time was Amōghavarsha I. It is significant that the Raṭṭa is conspicuous by his absence. The Pallavas soon retrieved their loss for it is said in the Bāhūr plates that by the efforts of Nṛipatuṅga, the very army which had been previously overpowered by the Pāṇḍya,— no doubt referring to the victory obtained by Śrīmāra,— had been made to conquer the Pāṇḍya. And quite in conformity with this statement, we have a stone inscription in which the reversed position of the Pāṇḍya and Pallava is clearly seen by Varaguṇa II, the son of Śrīmāra, figuring as subordinate of Nṛipatuṅga. The engagement between the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas in this instance is stated to have taken place on the banks of the Arichit by which is no doubt, meant the river Ariśilāṛu, a branch from the Kāvēri which flows near Pāpanāśaṁ in the Tanjore district. It must be about this time that the revived Chōḷa line taking possession of Tanjore established itself there. There is no doubt that at first the Chōḷas

must have been friendly towards their erstwhile overlords the Pallavas. The establishment of the Chōḷa with the capital at Tanjore is an evident check on any further aggressions of the Pāṇḍyas. Varaguṇa II did not continue to bear the Pallava yoke. Soon after the accession of Nṛipatuṅga's successor, Aparājita, he seems to have risen up in arms against the Pallava and advanced as far as Tiruppurambiyam in the Tanjore district where the Pallava king assisted by the Western Gaṅga ally Pṛithivīpati I, who was determined to secure victory to his overlord, attacked him and secured complete success. It was only marred by the death of Pṛithivīpati in the battlefield. The battle of Śrīpurambiyam may be placed somewhere about the last quarter of the ninth century A. D. perhaps just after the end of the reign of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarsha I and after the accession of his son and successor Kṛishṇarāja II. Though the several invasions of the Pāṇḍyas on the territory of the Pallavas directly affected the kings of the latter country and made them resist the tide of the former in order to save themselves from becoming a prey to the Pāṇḍyas, the Rāshṭrakūṭas who had been similarly making endeavours to subdue the surrounding powers could not have remained as passive onlookers assuming a neutral attitude, for if the Pallavas had succumbed, the Pāṇḍyas would have become a menace to their own kingdom in the south. They had already a fore-taste of the rising of some of the subdued powers.

In the first half of the ninth century A. D., events were marching with rapid strides for the determination of the suzerainty of the south. Just then the passing away of Gōvinda III, leaving the ship of State to drift in the boisterous ocean without a proper guiding hand, gave a set-back to the progress of the Rāshṭrakūṭas in that direction. Karkka and Baṅkēya, able in their own way, could not save the empire from being foundered and disintegrated. As narrated above, the Rāshṭrakūṭa hold on the Eastern Chāḷukyas, Western Gaṅgas, Pallavas and the Western Chāḷukya

successors, was practically lost before Amōghavarsha I could take up the command of the empire. A lover of peace by nature, with a yearning for literary persuits and given to practice of religious austerities, Amōghavarsha was found to be a square man in a round hole. He was quite unfit for the task that lay before him. He could not stem the rushing tide. The policy of the Rāshṭrakūṭas of favouring the younger and weaker members of the families of kings overcome by them as against the older and legitimate ones tried in the case of the Western Gaṅgas, Eastern Chāḷukyas and perhaps also the Western Chāḷukyas, in order to secure subordination, had been a total failure: nay it was even fatal. It had only been useful in creating ephemeral dissensions which the reigning powerful sovereigns tided over, sometimes with ease and sometimes with a little difficulty. Even the adoption of the policy of reconciliation by means of marriage alliances was of no avail. One Śīlamahādēvī was taken from and another Śīlamahādēvī was given to the Eastern Chāḷukyas. Nandivarman III had for his queen a Rāshṭrakūṭa princess by name Śaṅkhā and had by her a son called Nṛipatuṅga the same name that was also borne by Amōghavarsha I. To judge merely by the name there is a seeming likelihood of considering the Pallava Nṛipatuṅga as the grandson of Rāshṭrakūṭa Amōghavarsha I. But it may be noted that it is impossible that Śaṅkhā could have been the daughter of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Amōghavarsha I for we are informed that this king was only six years old or a few years more in A D. 814 and as such could not have had a grandson by his daughter who could be aged enough to become a ruler in A.D. 844. Nṛipatuṅga's date of accession is a fixed point in later Pallava chronology. It cannot be taken earlier than A. D. 844 for the reason that Varaguṇa Mahārāja II cannot figure as a subordinate in a record of the 18th year, as he actually does, and it cannot be later than that date for the reason that he and his successor Aparājita had reigned for 44 years before Toṇḍaināḍu passed into the hands of the Chōḷa Āditya I in A. D. 888. It is,

therefore, certain, that Śaṅkhā must have been a daughter of some other earlier member of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line. Knowing as we do that Śaṅkhā was a Rāshṭrakūṭa princess, the name Nṛipatuṅga,—bearing the distinct impress of the Rāshṭrakūṭa-*anvaya* like Sāhasatuṅga, Jagattuṅga etc.,—given to Pallava in preference to a Pallava name, is suggestive of the esteem with which Nandivarman III should have looked upon the Rāshṭrakūṭa connection and of his friendly attitude towards that family. Another important move made by the Rāshṭrakūṭas was, as noted already, the establishment of their capital at Mānykhēṭa which could have afforded better opportunities for watching the progress of the enemy states, besides being, a central place for the base of their military operations. Conjointly with the Pallavas, the Rāshṭrakūṭas established a sort of political overlordship over the Western Gaṅgas and they also appear to have had direct and closer touch with the administration of the province of Gaṅgavāḍi. It is not unlikely that the Rāshṭrakūṭas had a similar hand in the administration of the Pallava kingdom. The exact relationship of Kampavarman with either the Pallavas or Rāshṭrakūṭas remains yet to be known. At any rate the name is not a familiar one among the Pallavas.

Looked at from any point of view, the reign of Amōghavarsha I was not a glorious one in that it had failed to lift up the family from its fallen depth. Two or three years before his death Amōghavarsha seems to have entrusted the government to his son Kṛishṇa II.

Krishna II & his successors

There is evidence to the fact that Kṛishṇa II was in charge of the government of his country in the last days of his father. We have a record of Śaka 797 (A.D. 875) issued by him. There is also evidence that from the day of his father's demise in A. D. 878, he became an independent ruler. The earliest known record of his found at Hirebidiri in the Dharwar district is dated in A. D. 878. He had chiefly to contend in the South with the

Western Gaṅgas and Nolambas, and the Eastern Chāḷukyas. His Eastern Chāḷukya contemporaries were Vijayāditya III for the first ten years and the latter's successor Chāḷukya-Bhīma I for the rest of the period. Vijayāditya III was one of the most powerful sovereigns of his house and it is reported of him that he, at the request of the Raṭṭa, conquered the unequalled Gaṅgas, killed the Noḷamba chief Maṅgi in battle, put to fright Kṛishṇa-vallabha who was allied with or supported by Saṅkila. These things seem to have occurred in the reign of Amōghavarsha I in whose days the Vallabha was attacking the Rāshṭrakūṭas of both the houses and we have also noted how the Gaṅgas had practically become independent and thrown off the Rāshṭrakūṭa yoke. There was every reason for the Rāshṭrakūṭas to seek the aid of the Eastern Chāḷukyas, to put down the matchless Gaṅga and the fierce Vallabha and their allies Maṅgi and Saṅkila. Vijayāditya III had an ancient grudge against the Vallabha for it was the latter's forces that were aiding Bhīma-Saḷukki against Vijayāditya II. Here one should not fail to note that Vijayāditya III, fighting at the request of the Raṭṭa, could not have among the enemies a prince of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line. Therefore, that Kṛishṇa, whom Vijayāditya III overcame, must have been of a different house and also one of the open enemies of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. The Kaluchumbaṟṟu grant tells us that there was a Vallabha king named Kṛishṇa and it is very likely that this was the person against whom Vijayāditya III fought a few years ago. Vallabha being a hereditary foe of the Rāshṭrakūṭās, there is reason to believe that Vijayāditya III, fighting on behalf of the Rāshṭrakūṭas should include him among the enemies. It seems improbable that the Vallabhēndra or Kṛisnṇavallabha could be the Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa II.

Now, of Kṛishṇavallabha's friend and helpmate, it is said that he was called Gaṇḍa Sankila and that he was the lord of the Vaidumbas (A.R. on Ep. for 1914, p. 85 ; and the same for 1923, part II, para 20). This statement, if it has been correctly

made out, would invalidate the identity of Sankila with Sankaragaṇa, the brother-in-law of Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa II. Even if he be the brother-in-law of the Rāshṭrakūṭa king, there is no objection to his being a friend of Kṛishṇavallabha. Moreover from the passage which describes the various acts done by Vijayāditya III *viz.* (I) *Noḷamba Rāshṭrapatiṁ Maṅgiṁ hatvā*, (*ii*) *Ḍahaḷādīśaṁ* Gaṅgānāsrita *Gaṅgākūṭaśikharāt nirjitya*, and (*iii*) *Sankilaṁ ugra-Vallabhayutaṁ bhāyayitva*, we do not find anything to connect Sankila with Ḍāhaḷa. All that is said is that the lord of Ḍāhala was one among the chiefs overcome by Vijayāditya III. Another reference informs us that Vijayāditya burnt Chakrakūṭa, that he put to fright Sankila who was in company with Kṛishṇa and who had gone to Kiraṇapura, and that he defeated Vallabhēndra. There is not much in these references that would speak of Kṛishṇa and say definitely that he was a Rāshṭrakūṭa. On the other hand, they say plainly that he was a Vallabha king. At any rate, the question may well await elucidation from future researches.

After the demise of Vijayāditya III in A.D. 888, Kṛishṇa, like his predecessors, made a serious attempt to bring Vēṅgimaṇḍala under his subjection. He is reported to have surrounded it with his forces, perhaps to install on the Eastern Chāḷukya throne a younger member of the family— Yuddhamalla—and to enforce the people to prefer him to the legitimate Vikramāditya, who had, during the life-time of Vijayāditya III, been anointed a *yuvarāja*. History records that the Vēṅgi country was, at the time, over-run by the army of the Raṭṭas i. e. Rāshṭrakūṭas and of the agnates of the [redacted] late Eastern Chāḷukya king, just as by dense darkness after sunset (referring to the passing away of Vijayādity III) (*tad-anu-savitary-astaṅgatē timira paṭalēn-ēva Raṭṭa-dāyada balēna abhivyāptaṁ Vēṅgimaṇḍalam*). But the attempt of the Rāshṭrakūṭa was not successful, for Chāḷukya-Bhīma I the son of Vikramāditya, finally obtained the kingdom.[1]

1. Jitvā samyati Kṛishṇa-Vallabha- mahādaṇḍam sa-dāyādikam Bhīmō bhūpatir anvabhuṅkta bhuvanam.

In this war also, the Vallabha king cotributed his own might to the troubles of the Eastern Chāḷukyas. It is said that the Vallabha king assisted by Karnāṭa and Lāṭa, fought against Bhiīma I[1]: the son of this Bhīma called Iramartigaṇḍa, a prince of charming appearance and valour like Abhimanyu, learned and powerful, died after fighting bravely on the battle-fields of Niravadyapura (Niḍadavōlu and Peruvaṅgūr-grāma, killing in the latter place from the back of his elephant the general of the Vallabha king, Daṇḍēna Guṇḍaya.[2]

The records of Indra III are dated in the Śaka years 836, 837 and 838 (A. D. 914, 915 and 916). They are the Bagumra plates and the stone inscriptions of Hiremagnūr. During his reign the governorship of Banavāsi was under Dōra and Baṅkēya. The Mahāsāmanta Bijja was ruling Kogali 500, and Masiyavāḍi 140. There was fight with Aṇṇiga. He was practically succeeded by Gōvinda IV who is reported to have quietly (*i. e.* without bloodshed) set aside his brother Amōghavarsha II and usurped the throne. The records of Gōvinda IV range from Śake 840 (Daṇḍapūr) to Śaka 855 (Kavajgere inscription and Sangli plates). Thus, they range in date from A. D. 918 to 933. Baṅkēya continued to have the rule of Banavāśi in Śaka 850. The plates record that the rivers Gaṅga and Yamunā were doing service at his palace; which means that he conquered and reduced to subjection the Chāḷukyas who had these emblems. We have already referred to a verse which states that when he started on a tour of conquest the *Pālidhvaja*, in the shape of the hands of a woman (Earth) released from the possession of an evil lord *Kunātha)* danced with joy and paid regard to Gōvinda. There was trouble again with the Eastern Chāḷukya-Bhīma II (A.D. 934-45) who is reported to have defeated an army sent by Gōvinda IV (Ind. Ant. Vol. XII. p. 249). The Maśūlipatam plates of Amma II record that Chāḷukya-Bhīma II expelled the dense darkness which was the

1. A.R. on S. I. Ep. for 1914, para 6, p. 84 f.
2. Ibid p.81.

army of the Rāshṭrakūṭas. (A. R. for 1909, para 60). Gōvinda IV is said to have given himself to evil ways, ruined his constitution, weakened the government and thus, met with destruction. Thus, though the commencement of the reign of Gōvinda IV was promising for the rise of the Rāshṭrakūṭas, by some successes scored by him, his valour was soon consumed by his extreme licentiousness and he became physically incapacitated and was beaten by his enemies. The State was all but ruined. But fortunately it was saved by the prevalence of wise counsel, which made the aged Amōghavarsha III assume the reigns of government. The Deoli plates say of Amōghavarsha III that he ascended the throne to maintain the greatness of the sovereignty of the Raṭṭas. His reign is important for the marriage alliance that was contracted between the Rāshṭrakūṭas and the Western Gaṅgas. Amōghavarsha's daughter Rēvakanimmaḍi was married to Bhūtuga II and this alliance could knit the two families more closely. Kṛishṇa III ascended the throne in A. D. 940 and in his earliest record (Deoli grant), he is stated to have deposed Rāchamalla and put in his place Bhūtuga II. Accordingly, the latter figures as a Rāshṭrakūṭa feudatory in records dated in Śaka years corresponding to A. D. 942 (Rōṇ) 946 (Kurtkōṭi) and 949–50 (Naregal and Ātakūr). Krishna III came in conflict with the Chōḷas. We must say a few words as to how this came about.

The powerful Eastern Chāḷukya Vijayāditya III died in A. D. 888. In the Maśūlipatam collector's office plates, it is reported that, besides burning the three cities Kirāṇapura, Achalapura and Nellūrapura, he took by force the gold of the Gaṅga kings of Kaliṅga, the elephants of the kings of Kōśala and the gold of the Pāṇḍyas and Pallavas in order that they may distribute them in charity. If this is not a mere boast, it would

At the gates of the palace of Vijayāditya III, there were carved the emblems Ganga, Yamunā, the Moon, the Sun and the Halikētana (tritiya Vijayāditya-dvāri-pratishṭāpita-Gangā-Yamunā-Chandra Āditya-Hālikētana)

appear that he followed up his victory over others by directing his arms to subdue the Pāṇḍyas and Pallavas also. The opportunity for his military operations might have been occasioned when he, at the request of Amōghavarsha conducted an expedition against the Western Gaṅgas. The same year *i. e.* A. D. 888 also saw the passing away of another great sovereign of South India *i. e.* the Pallava Aparājita. This king was overpowered by the Chōḷa Āditya I in battle. What made the Chōḷas, who, sometime before, had been the chief confidant of the Pallava to take up arms against his overlord remains a mystery. After the Pallava Aparājita vanished from the scene, the Western Gaṅgas became the feudatories of the Chōḷa victor and his successors. And the Rāshṭrakūṭas had necessarily to come in conflict with the newly risen power of the Chōḷas who espoused the cause of the members of the Śivamāra line. Pṛithivīpati I being dead, his descendant Pṛithivīpati II, the son of Māraśiṁha II, became a feudatory of Āditya I in whose reign he had made a grant at Takkōlam. During the time of Kṛishṇa II's successors the Rāshṭrakūṭas were in a dormant state until Kṛishṇa III came to assume the reigns of government. In this period the Chōḷas were all powerful in Southern India and Parāntaka I, son of Āditya I, with indomitable strength pushed further the conquest of his father and widened his empire. What is important for us here is that he defeated the Bāṇas and gave their kingdom to Pṛithivīpati II. This happened before A. D. 923, which is the date of the Udayēndiram plates. No hand was raised against him by the Rāshṭrakūṭa successors of Kṛishṇa I. But Kṛishṇa III, as soon as he came to the throne, saw clearly the situation, invaded the Chōḷa territory successfully, supported as he was by his powerful brother-in-law Bhūtuga II, and occupied a portion of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. In his first attempt, he does not seem to have fared well. The Kanyākumāri inscription tells us that Parāntaka I conquered in battle the unconquered Kṛishṇarāja and was thence known as Vīra-Chōḷa :—

Yaj-jigāya Vijayōpamadyutiḥ Kṛishṇarājām ajitam narādhipaiḥ
Bhūri-Vikrama-vivarddhita-dyutiḥ Vīra Chōḷa iti tēna kīrtyatē ||
v. 58, p. 143 of T. A. S. Vol. III.

The Proddaṭūru inscription probably refers to this in verse 21. This encounter between Parāntaka I and Kṛishṇa III must have happened before A. D. 944. The fact recorded in the Kanyākumāri inscription has not only dispelled the illusion caused by a mistaken statement made in the Larger Leiden plates, but has confirmed the inference drawn from the inscriptions of Kṛishṇa III found in the Tamil country, which are dated from the 5th year of his reign to the 28th *i.e.* from A.D. 944 to A.D. 967. The statement made in the Leiden plates was that after Parāntaka passed away, his son Rājāditya became the lord of the earth and that the latter died in battle fighting with Kṛishṇarāja. This had naturally given rise to the belief that the reign of Parāntaka I must have ended by A.D. 947 which is the date of the Ātakūr inscription mentioning the death of Rājāditya. Parāntaka's date of accession having been well fixed to be A.D. 907, the few inscriptions dated in years later than the 40th year of reign and one in particular which was dated in the 46th year began to be discredited. But recently an inscription of the 48th year of reign of Parāntaka I, expressed both in words and figures, was found, proving clearly that he reigned till A.D. 954- : that Rājāditya, who died in A.D. 947, could not have succeeded him and that the clash with the Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa III did certainly happen in the reign of Parāntaka I. A single attempt was made by the Chōḷas to recover Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and it did cost the life of prince Rājāditya. Kṛishṇa III had a state entry into the conquered country of Taṇḍaimaṇḍalam in A.D. 947 and this is reported in the Chōḷapuram record. The Karhad plates dated 9th March 959 A.D, let us know that Kṛishṇa III was encamped with his victorious army at Mēlpaḍī and established his followers in the southern provinces, took possession of the estates of the provincial chiefs and built temples to Kāḷapriya,

Gaṇḍamārtāṇḍa, Kṛishṇēśvara etc. A Bāgali inscription of Kṛishṇa III tells us that he was ruling from Mēlpāṭi in A.D. 956 which is three years before the date of the Karhad plates. That Kṛishṇa III retained possession of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam till his death is amply proved by the existence of numerous inscriptions of his found in the Tamil country.

During the days of Kṛishṇa III the Western Chāḷukyas, who had by constant fighting with the successive Rāshṭrakūṭa kings Dantidurga, Kṛishṇa I, Gōvinda II, Dhruva I, the three successive feudatory kings of the Gujerat branch of Rāshṭrakūṭās who were contemporaries of Āmōghavarsha I, and Gōvinda IV, having become exhausted, quietly bore the Rāshṭrakūṭa yoke and were content to hold subordinate position under Kṛishṇa III One of the inscriptions of Kṛishṇa III discovered at Bāgali in the Bellary district [1], dated in Śaka 868, Krōdhi (A. D. 944-5) mentions the Mahāśāmanta Kaṭyēra of the Chāḷukya family and states that he was ruling over Kōgali 500, and Māśiyavāḍi 140. Another record of the king found at Kārjōḷ in the Bijapur district [2], dated in Śaka 879, Piṅgala, Āśvayuja, su 5, Thursday (A.D.956, September 11), registers a grant of land made to the Saṁbayyanakeṟe (tank), while Tailapayya, a subordinate of the king was governing the *nāḍu*. Though the family to which Tailapayya belonged is not given in the record, we may take it that he was a western Chāḷukya, judging from his name. At the time of this record, Kṛishṇa III is stated to have been ruling at Mēlpāṭi. A third record of the same king discovered at Bāgali[3] dated in Śaka 878, Naḷa (A. D. 956 December 23), refers to a grant made by a chief named Chāḷukyanārāyaṇa Dōrappayya. And the last of all is a record from Narśalgi of the Bijapur district [4]. It is dated in Śaka 886, Raktākshi etc., (A. D.

1. No. 74 of M.E.C. for 1904 and 64 of S. I. I. Vol. IX. Part I.
2. No. 178 of Bk. No. 1933-4.
3. No. 100 of M.E.C. for 1904 and No. 66 of S.I.I.Vol. IX. Part. I.
4. No. 113 of Bk. C. for 1929-30 and No. 40 of S. I. I. Vol. XI. Part. I.

965, March 6), and states that the *Mahās'āmantādhipati* Āhavamalla Tailaparaśa entitled Chāḷukyarāma, of Śatyāśraya family was a subordinate of Akālavarsha (i. e. Kṛishṇa III). The feudatory is stated to have been governing Tarḍḍavāḍi 1000, as *anuṅga jīvita*. These records show that the position of the Western Chāḷukyas had dwindled down to that of the commanders of armies and that they were enjoying the remuneration fixed therefor in the shape of *Jīvita*. We are reminded here of a similar subordinate position held by Chōḷamahārāja Kumārāṅkuśa under the Pallava Nandivarman III, of Naraśanāyaka under the Vijayanagara emperor of his day, as well as of the later Pallava Peruñjiṅga under the Chōḷa Rājarāja III, which position, when the ruling kings became weak or suffered reverses at the hand of other kings, gave excellent opportunities to assert independence. The Western Chāḷukya Mahāśāmantādhipati Āhavamalla Tailaparasa had not long to wait for such an opportunity. When Kṛishṇa III passed away and was succeeded by Khoṭṭiga, the Paramāra Śīyaka Harsha inflicted a severe defeat on the Rāshṭrakūṭas. Neither Khoṭṭiga nor his weaker successor Karkka was able to retrieve the loss or improve the position. Taila killed Muñja, and easily overthrew the Rāshṭrakūṭa in battle, destroyed the two pillars of victory set up in the capital, and assuming to himself the ancient regal dignity reigned for 24 years.

This is the history of the hard and persistent struggle put up by the various members of the Śatyāśraya family from the days of Kīrtivarman II, all through the period of existence of the Rāshṭrakūṭas since the time of Dantidurga, as we are able to gather from the records of their enemies. From these very records we could also gather that the last member of the Chāḷukya family, by virtue of his position as Mahāśāmantādhipati, had the power and means to contribute to the final triumph and accomplishment of the Western Chāḷukya object viz. the recovery of the lost kingdom. In the several campaigns of

Kṛishṇa III, this scion of the ancient Śatyāśraya stock had ample opportunities of displaying his valour and proving his merit, which must have earned for him the meaningful title of Āhavamalla. It is significant that he had this title even before he assumed regal powers that soon awaited him. It is noteworthy that he is styled in the record of Kṛishṇa III a *Śatyāśraya* which proves that he did not foist it to his name when he became a ruler. Kṛishṇa's victories, glorious as they were, left to his successors a legacy of more enemies. The last two kings of the Rāshṭrakūṭa line were not able to handle the situation, as well, as Krishṇa III. It is but natural that they should have had to depend on their powerful general. From the ancestral account furnished in several of the grants of the Western Chāḷukyas of Kalyāṇi, it is gathered that, besides Taila II, his father and grandfather had contracted marriage relationship with the reigning kings of different houses. We might well agree with Fleet that the father-in-law of Taila's grandfather was the Rāshṭrakūṭa Kṛishṇa II. Bonthādēvī, the mother of Taila II, was the daughter of the Chēdi king Lakshmaṇa. Taila II himself had married Jakkavve, a Rāshṭrakūṭa princess. Taila's position as the chief *Sāmanta*, his command of the army, the connection of himself and his ancestors with the ruling families, added to his own proved abilities, must no doubt have secured for him a well deserved esteem; and there is nothing to be wondered at if he succeeded in the endeavour in which many had failed before him.

We have made an attempt in these lectures to trace the doings of the members of the western Chāḷukya line since the day they were overthrown by Dantidurga— with of course, a few missing links—till they regained their position. The names of the members are missing except for one Rāhappa. Even if they had been preserved, it is certain that they will not be found in the ancestry of Taila, who finally subverted the Rāshṭrakūṭas and got back the Western Chāḷukya kingdom, unless his pedigree

gave the members of all the collateral branches. The object of a pedigree is to trace the line of descent of a king from the earliest celebrated ancestor. There is no doubt that connected with the same early ancestor, there might have been numerous others during the space of two and a half centuries and it is vain to expect any of them in the genealogy of Taila II.

W. Chāḷukyas

609
Pulakēśin II
642
655
Vikramāditya I
680
Vinayāditya
696
Vijayāditya
733
Vikramāditya II
746
Kīrttivarman II
758
Rāhappa

Rāshṭrakūṭas

742
Dantidurga
758
Kṛishṇa I
775
Gōvinda and Dhruva
794
Gōvinda III
813
Amōghavarsha
878
Kṛishṇa II
914
Indra II
917
Amōghavarsha II
and Gōvinda IV
935
Amōghavarsha III
940
Kṛishṇa III
968

Pallavas and Chōḷas

696
Paramēśvara-
varman II
Nandivarman
Pallavamalla
761
Dantivarman
812
Nandivarman III
844
Nṛipatuṅga
870
Aparājita
888
Āditya I
907
Parāntaka I
955

W. Gaṅgas

726
Śrīpurusha
788
Sivamāra
817
Rājamalla I
825
Pṛithvīpati I
870

E. Chāḷukyas

709
Vishṇuvardhana III
746
Vijayāditya I
764
Vishṇuvardhana IV
799
Vijayāditya II
Narēndramṛigarāja
843
Kali Vishṇuvardhana V
844
Guṇaga Vijayāditya III
888
Chāḷukya Bhīma I
918
Amma I
925
Vikramāditya II
926
Yuddhamalla II
934
Chāḷukya Bhīma II
945
Amma II
970

ERRATA

Page	Line	For	Read
4	27	unearths	unearth
8	15	with	
11	1	copyists	copyist
21	33	insisted,	insisted.
21	33	in	In
32	16	bashyas	Bhāshyas
32	19	living	giving
32	22	sishṭhas	sishṭas
34	3	affords	afford
35	1	notting	noting
36	11	are	is
36	23	belief	belief.
37	25	subtlity	subtlety
38	9	Periyapurēnam	Periyapurāṇam
42	24	agree	agrees
42	31	Paśastis	Pras'astis
44	9	indispensible	indispensable
46	4	descendent	descendant
47	2	descendent	descendant
47	7	descendent	descendant
48	34	feuda	feudal
49	2	descendent	descendants
49	19	Pattapi	Pottapi
49	21	do	do.
52	1	Kandhara	Kandara
52	14	Kandarāja	Kandararāja
52	15	do	do.
54	24	evidence	evident
55	5	he	the
56	4	rules	rulers
58	16	pullava	Pallava
58	16	witaut	without
61	4	rāshṭrakutas	Rāshṭrakūṭas
63	12	add	added
64	7	account	accounts
66	16	obivous	obvious
67	13	samāsana	samsēna
71	6	Pālidhvajāval	Pālidhvajāvali
71	13	n	in
80	26	Ane	And
88	21	incarceratian	incar ceration
115	column 3 line 3	Paramēśvara-laxman II	Paramēśvara-varman